DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 459 580 EC 308 768

AUTHOR Ostrosky, Michaelene M.
TITLE CASEI Project (Consultation and Administration Specialists in Early Intervention) Final Report.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Special Education.
SPONS AGENCY Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 2001-08-30
NOTE 137p.
CONTRACT H029G960203
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Early Childhood Education; *Early Intervention; Family Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; Interdisciplinary Approach; Nontraditional Education; Personnel; *Professional Education; *Rural Education; *Special Education Teachers; Specialists; Teaching Models

ABSTRACT

This final report describes the activities and accomplishments of the Consultation and Administration Specialists in Early Intervention Project (CASEI). This federally funded project was developed to provide cross-disciplinary preservice training for early intervention (EI) specialists in Illinois. Students were recruited from a broad range of disciplines involved in early intervention. Additionally, the project recruited and was specifically designed to meet the training needs of personnel currently employed in rural early intervention settings. Training was provided within a format that allowed students to maintain their employment, including a combination of summer and weekend coursework, and two internships. Both the coursework and the internships reflected a family-centered, collaborative, and interdisciplinary team perspective. Response from CASEI students indicates that they believe the quality of the personnel preparation project offers a model for personnel preparation that can address the shortage of highly skilled early interventionists who work with children with disabilities and their families in rural areas. The report contains information describing the completion of the project's goals and objectives. The appendices provide documentation of CASEI course requirements, examples of course ratings and student feedback, student demographics, and examples of surveys and other artifacts developed during the course of the project. (SG)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 459 580

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services

84.029G

H029G960203

Preservice Personnel Training

Final Report

CASEI Project: Consultation and Administration Specialists in Early Intervention

Michaelene M. Ostrosky, Ph.D.
Department of Special Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Phone: 217/333-0260

Date of Original Application: June 6, 1996
CASEI Project Dates: January, 1997-May, 2001
Date of Final Report: August 30, 2001

EC 308768

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. Project Summary

This is the final report for the Consultation and Administration Specialists in Early Intervention Project (CASEI). This project was developed to provide cross-disciplinary preservice training for early intervention specialists in Illinois. Students were recruited from the range of disciplines involved in early intervention, providing services to infants and toddlers with special needs and their families. In addition, the project recruited and was specifically designed to meet the training needs of personnel currently employed in rural early intervention (EI) and related service programs (e.g. child care, public health). In this way, the project capitalized on the probability that the students recruited would continue working in rural areas as EI service providers. Participants worked on a master's degree in Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) with an emphasis on administration and consultation.

The CASEI Project responded to the needs of current personnel by providing accessible initial training and retraining within a format that allowed students to maintain their employment. The Project included a combination of weekend and summer coursework (e.g. typically, six Saturdays during the fall and spring semesters and some two-day weekend courses offered during the summer) with numerous applied experiences embedded within the coursework. There were two internships, both of which were supervised under the guidance of project staff. The first was a structured, competency-based administrative and/or consultative internship that focused on student-identified areas at their own work sites. The second was a competency-based on-campus parent/infant play group that was offered for teams of students on a weekend format. Both the coursework and internship experiences reflected the project philosophy that is a family-centered, collaborative, and interdisciplinary team perspective.

2. Project Status

The CASEI Project began operation in January, 1997. From January 1997 until August 1997 the Project Coordinator (PC) position was filled on a part-time basis by Ms. Dolores Appl, a full time doctoral student. During the first seven months of the project, Ms. Appl did an excellent job of recruiting students, advising students, and supervising two students during their on-site internship experiences. Ms. Bernadette Laumann assumed the full-time duties as the Project Coordinator for CASEI on 8/05/97. Ms. Laumann wrote a continuation report for the CASEI Project dated 4/01/98, and worked with the project through the no-cost extension which ended in May, 2001.

In 1998, Dr. Michaelene Ostrosky, the Principal Investigator (PI) for the CASEI Project, was notified by the U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services that we were no longer required to write a continuation proposal in order to continue the activities of the CASEI Project. Therefore this final report describes the activities, accomplishments, and outcomes for the CASEI Project from 4/01/98 through 5/20/01 when the project ended.

Goal 1.0: Administration structures and procedures will be established and implemented to ensure that students participate in a well-coordinated, cohesive, and integrated learning experience.

Objective 1.1: To maintain a Core Program Committee (C.P.C.) consisting of ECSE faculty, two parents, and two CASEI students

Objective 1.2: To maintain a program Advisory Committee (consisting of the core committee members *and* an early childhood faculty member, a human development/family studies faculty member and two EI Program administrators)

Accomplishments: During the first two years of the grant these committees met and were kept informed about CASEI Project activities through meetings and reports. This was especially important in reviewing philosophy statements, designing consultative and administrative content to add to each course, and to plan activities for the internships. As the project continued it became less critical to convene Advisory Committee meetings; however Advisory Committee members received updates about the CASEI Project. The ECSE faculty met regularly to keep abreast of project accomplishments and CASEI student issues. Advisory Committee members will receive a copy of this final report.

Outcomes: A list of consultative and administrative content that was embedded into courses along with some examples of course syllabi can be found in Appendix A .

Objective 1.3: To develop and submit all reports needed by OSERS

Accomplishments: Monthly financial records are maintained by the Special Education Department administrative secretary and shared with the PI and PD each month. A description of the final budget status is included in Part 4 of this report.

Goal 2.0: A curriculum will be developed in accord with the CASEI Model and in accord with the stated philosophy about early intervention.

Objective 2.1: To develop philosophy statements to guide program development, implementation, and evaluation

Objective 2.2: To outline competencies describing knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for early intervention professionals, based on recommended practice

Objective 2.3: To develop coursework needed to enable students to develop competencies in early intervention

Accomplishments: Philosophy statements and competencies were revised with input from the Core Committee and Advisory Committee members during the first year of the CASEI Project. The philosophy statements and competencies (see Appendix A) have been used to guide the curriculum in the courses offered to CASEI students. The philosophy statements and competenices are based on the *DEC Recommended Practices* (Odom & McLean, 1996) for personnel competence. These competencies have been embedded into the courses and practica experiences (see sample course syllabi in Appendix A). Courses that were offered on the non-traditional format (weekend and weekend/Internet-based) were re-designed with an emphasis on administration, leadership, and consultation. On-site and on-campus practica experiences were also re-designed to emphasize competencies in administration, leadership, and consultation.

Outcomes: At the end of each course the students anonymously complete Instructor & Course Evaluation System (ICES) forms. These forms are then sent to a central evaluation office at the University of Illinois. Instructors receive these feedback forms the following semester. The overall course rating and individual instructor scores are computed. The students' comments about the class and any input regarding improvements to the course are written on these forms. This method of evaluation informs the instructor as to what aspects of the course need improvement and what aspects of the course were most helpful to students. Courses are then revised based on student input. Examples of ICES course ratings and instructor ratings for two CASEI Project courses are included in Appendix B.

Goal 3.0: Field experiences will be available to enable students to develop skills, knowledge, and attitudes necessary for providing early intervention services to infants and toddlers with special needs and their families.

Objective 3.1: To develop and maintain internships in accord with the program philosophy

Objective 3.2: To develop Competency Based Tasks (CBTs) to guide students in obtaining specific competencies that focus on consultative and administrative roles within their own work settings

Objective 3.3: To develop and maintain a variety of observation sites exemplifying different EI service delivery systems and approaches

Objective 3.4: To develop and provide applied experiences to supplement and enhance coursework

Objective 3.5: To provide procedures and materials for supervision of students in internships

Accomplishments:
Objectives 3.1, 3.2, 3.4 : An on-campus internship experience (Parent/Infant Play Group) was offered three times on the Saturday format (see syllabus in Appendix C). CASEI students together with other local students and faculty planned, implemented, and evaluated play groups for infants/toddlers and their parents. The play groups included both children with and without disabilities as well as families from diverse cultures. Each time the on-campus internship was offered, feedback from previous students was used to improve the course for the next group of students. A major aspect of the play group internship that students have found particularly relevant to their work in early intervention is the development of a set of philosophy statements which then guide the planning and implementation of the play group itself.

Objective 3.3: An assignment in SpEd 466 (Organizing for Early Intervention) involved visiting and evaluating a birth-three program site somewhere in Illinois. Students visited various birth –three agencies in the state and wrote program descriptions of these sites thus providing information about a variety of programs and different EI delivery systems and approaches. Program sites included Early Intervention programs, Early Head Start Programs, and inclusive child care settings.

Objectives 3.2, 3.5: For the on-site internship completed at the student's work site, Competency Based Tasks (CBTs) specific to administration and consultation were developed with input from CASEI students, parents, university supervisors, and program administrators. A CASEI Internship Notebook was developed that includes The Individual Field Experiences Plan (IFEP), Internship Time Log, Internship Self-Evaluation Guide, Internship Evaluation Form, and Supervisor Evaluation Form (see Appendix C). All students who have participated in the on-site internship have designed (with university supervisor assistance) their own unique internship experience. Students kept journals or wrote reflection papers during the internship experience. A final product is completed by each student at the culmination of the internship experience. Some examples of CASEI student internship final products include inservice programs, revised

Head Start and Early Head Start policy manuals, designs for new programs that specifically address the needs of teen mothers with new babies, and a sign language manual for distribution to parents.

Outcomes: CASEI Project students have learned a specific model for conducting an inclusive parent/infant play group. Some have used aspects of this play group model in their work sites and have come to appreciate the importance of having a program philosophy to guide the activities planned for parents and infants who attend their groups. Many students also experienced the opportunity to work with families from diverse cultures and to discuss culturally relevant early intervention practices with families.

As a result of the applied experiences that are embedded into the courses, CASEI students and other graduate students taking CASEI sponsored courses are more aware of the various birth - three programs available in the state. The reader should take note that during the entire time the CASEI Project has been in existence (1997-2001) the state of Illinois has been engaged in major reforms in the area of early intervention. As a result of field experiences and activities required through coursework, CASEI students were provided opportunities to enhance their knowledge of early intervention systems and systems change, observe various EI programs in the state, form relationships with new colleagues in their cohort, and network with guest speakers invited to present in their classes.

<u>Goal 4.0</u> : At least 24 students will be funded by the CASEI project, and will be qualified to provide direct early intervention services in a variety of consultation and administration roles in rural settings serving infants with special needs and their families.

Objective 4.1 To maintain 12 students per year from rural areas of the state, as participants in the CASEI project

Objective 4.2 To advise CASEI Project students as they progress through their respective programs of study

Objective 4.3 To develop and implement materials and procedures for evaluating students' progress through CASEI coursework and internships

Accomplishments: Records indicate that from 1997-2001, 61 people inquired about the CASEI Project. Information about the CASEI Project was disseminated throughout the state through EI newsletters, StarNet workshops (training and technical assistance system for children with disabilities ages birth-five and their families), and state-wide conferences. Many people learned about the project from friends and colleagues who were CASEI students.

A total of 25 students applied to the CASEI Project. Of these applicants 21 met the criteria for admission to the CASEI Project. Of the 21 students admitted to CASEI, 11 students have graduated with a master of education (M.Ed.) degree in special education from the University of

Illinois. There are 6 CASEI students still enrolled in the master's program in early childhood special education. These students should all graduate within 2 years if they continue their current trajectory of part-time studies in EI. Three CASEI students took one or more courses and then chose not to pursue their master's degree. One student did not accept admission due to family reasons. In addition, 3 students who completed their M.Ed. degrees in 1997 started their degrees under a different OSEP grant (EISI), but completed their M.Ed. through the CASEI Project (see Appendix C for CASEI Student Demographics).

Students admitted to the CASEI Project work in settings that serve rural populations as well as suburban, town/small city, and urban settings. This reflects the structure of the early intervention system in Illinois where most agencies serve families from diverse geographic areas within a county or region of the state.

CASEI student advising was conducted via personal contact, written course announcements, telephone conversations, and e-mail. Each student file contained individual advising forms and notes regarding advising and monitoring of students' progress. Internship supervisors met with ECSE faculty and the CASEI Project Coordinator on a regular basis to report student progress and discuss student issues. A matrix listing all CASEI students and the dates they completed required courses was developed and continually updated to assist in monitoring students' progress.

Outcomes: A total of 23 students were awarded partial or full funding as a result of the CASEI Project. The CASEI Project provided funds for 11 CASEI students and 3 carry-over students from a different OSEP grant (EISI) to complete their M.Ed. degree in early childhood special education. Six CASEI students are still enrolled in the graduate program in early childhood special education (ECSE) and plan to complete their degrees. Since the CASEI Project funded personnel to teach non-traditional courses, other graduate students (not only those specifically enrolled in CASEI) were able to take early childhood special education classes. Graduate students from the Departments of Social Work, Speech and Hearing Sciences, and Curriculum and Instruction were able to take courses through the non-traditional format. Additionally local early childhood practitioners who wanted to take a particular course and remain employed were able to enroll in the non-traditional class. The nature of the non-traditional format of the CASEI Project allowed students to form collegial relationships with other early intervention providers from around the state. Students were also challenged to use new technology (e.g., the Internet, e-mail) to complete assignments and communicate with faculty and other students.

<u>Goal 5.0</u>: Other universities will benefit from the model, procedure and products developed through this project.

Objective 5.1 To disseminate materials and procedures to other institutions of higher education in the state and nationally

Objective 5.2 To provide opportunities for observation and consultation for faculty from other universities wishing to develop early intervention training programs with an emphasis on consultation and administration

Accomplishments: Both Dr. Ostrosky (CASEI Project Principal Investigator) and Ms. Laumann (CASEI Project Coordinator) have participated in national and state level conferences in order to disseminate information about the CASEI Project. The following is a list of the specific presentations involving materials and procedures generated through the CASEI Project:

1. Dr. Ostrosky presented a conference session at the Council for Exceptional Children Teacher Education Division (TED) in Savannah, GA (November, 1997). At this session participants learned about the CASEI model, innovations and future directions in Early Childhood Special Education professional development.

2. Ms. Laumann co-presented a conference session at the Council for Exceptional Children Division for Early Childhood (DEC) International Conference in Washington, D.C. (December, 1999). At this session participants learned about the CASEI model and the development of an Internet-based graduate course. CASEI materials and procedures were made available to participants. Following this session, Ms. Laumann was contacted by faculty at two other institutions for additional information. CASEI Project materials were mailed to these individuals.

3. Ms. Laumann co-presented a conference session on the components of the parent/infant playgroup internship at the Iowa Faculty Development Conference held in Des Moines, IA (April, 2000). Materials and information about the CASEI Project on- campus internship was made available to faculty from institutions of higher education across Iowa.

4. Dr. Ostrosky co-presented a conference session at the Council for Exceptional Children Teacher Education Division (TED) in Las Vegas, NV (November, 2000). At this session participants learned about the CASEI model and aspects of using an Internet-based course with non-traditional early childhood special education graduate students.

5. Two conference poster sessions were presented which included handouts describing courses, the supervision model, Saturday course syllabi, budget components, sample internship projects, and other examples of CASEI Project materials. One poster session was held at the bi-annual Illinois' Sharing A Vision Early Childhood conference in Springfield, IL (October, 1997). The other poster session took place at the Council for Exceptional Children Teacher Education Division (TED) conference in Savannah, GA (November, 1997). Many people received handouts and information about the CASEI Project at these sessions.

6. Dr. Ostrosky and Ms. Laumann co-authored an article describing the components of the CASEI Project including CASEI student comments about participating in the Project.

The article was submitted to the Innovative Practices section of the *Journal of Early Intervention* and was returned for revisions. Dr. Ostrosky and Ms. Laumann plan to revise the article with updated CASEI Project evaluation data and resubmit it to this journal.

Outcomes: As a result of presentations at both national and state conferences faculty at other institutions of higher learning have had the opportunity to learn about the CASEI Project. Dr. Ostrosky and Ms. Laumann have also spoken on the phone to faculty interested in developing non-traditional types of courses or training programs. The rich technological resources of an institution like the University of Illinois made it possible to offer CASEI students the opportunity to complete a course using the Internet and to become comfortable with the use of technology. Information about the CASEI program was added to the University of Illinois Special Education Department's web page with the intention that early childhood special education practitioners and faculty at other institutions would learn about this project. Hopefully with the publication of an article describing the CASEI Project, more faculty from other institutions will contact Dr. Ostrosky about developing non-traditional training programs for early intervention personnel.

Goal 6.0: Program evaluation will indicate that the project is successful in accomplishing goals and objectives

Objective 6.1 To determine whether students successfully complete coursework requirements

Objective 6.2 To determine whether the project has met its stated goals and objectives according to the project timeline

Objective 6.3 To evaluate the validity of the CASEI Project and model for training early interventionists for consultation and administration roles

Accomplishments:

Objective 6.1: Dr. Ostrosky had access to the CASEI students' transcripts via the University of Illinois student on-line data base. In addition, when CASEI students completed a course they submitted reimbursement forms to Ms. Laumann (CASEI Project Coordinator). This ensured that Ms. Laumann was able to monitor course completion and update student files. CASEI Project students were only reimbursed for courses in which they earned a grade of "A" or "B."

Objective 6.2: After the first year of the project, Dr. Ostrosky and Ms. Laumann had primary responsibility for carrying out project activities in relation to the stated timelines. Due to carryover funds, the CASEI Project was able to fund students beyond the December, 1999 ending date. The carryover funds were critical for many CASEI students in order for them to complete their M.Ed. degree. Since the CASEI students worked full time and had other family

responsibilities, many of the students needed a flexible timeline for completing their degree. Project goals, objectives, and activities were completed according to stated timelines.

Objective 6.3: Dr. Ostrosky and Ms. Laumann developed the CASEI Student Survey and mailed it to the CASEI students at the mid-point of the project (1998). When the CASEI Project ended (May, 2001) a final survey was developed and mailed to the 11 graduates of the CASEI Project. A separate survey was developed and mailed to the 6 continuing students. Each CASEI Project student (both graduated students and continuing students) was also mailed the CASEI Project Competency Rating Scale and a copy of the CASEI Project Philosophy Statements. Self-addressed stamped envelopes were provided for students to return the surveys and rating scales to one of Dr. Ostrosky's graduate assistants. In order to assure anonymity this doctoral student, who was not affiliated with the CASEI Project, summarized all of the survey results and computed means for the competency rating scales. Students were also provided with stamped, numbered postcards to return when they had mailed back the survey and rating scales. When the doctoral student received the numbered postcard and it matched the numbers on the rating scale and survey, the student was mailed a professional book (*Young Exceptional Children Monograph Series on Natural Environments and Inclusion*) as a "thank-you" gift for completing the survey and scale.

CASEI students' employers were also mailed a copy of the CASEI Project Competency Rating Scale and asked to evaluate the student/employee in the areas of competence addressed in the CASEI courses and internships. CASEI student employers were also provided with stamped self-addressed envelopes and asked to return the rating scales to Dr. Ostrosky's graduate assistant who then summarized the results. (See Appendix D for copies of letters, surveys and competency rating scales).

Outcomes: **CASEI Student Surveys**
Summaries of the CASEI Student surveys indicate that 8 of 11 (73 %) CASEI Project graduates and 4 of 6 (67 %) continuing CASEI students returned the CASEI Student survey and CASEI Competency Rating Scale. On the CASEI Student Survey, graduates and continuing students were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with the CASEI Program (with 5 being high satisfaction and 1 being low). The following numbers indicate mean scores for the items related to satisfaction with the CASEI Program:

	Graduates	Continuing
Overall quality of academic instruction	4.87	4.75
Overall quality of academic guidance	4.87	4.75
Quality of on-campus internship	4.62	5.00
Quality of on-site internship	4.62	4.33
Overall satisfaction with CASEI Program	5.00	5.00

It is clear the from these mean scores that the students who returned the surveys had a high level of overall satisfaction with the CASEI Program. Summaries of CASEI student demographics

and students' statements that were written on the returned surveys in response to open-ended questions are included in Appendix E.

An important component of the CASEI Project was the match between the philosophy standards of the CASEI Project and the coursework and internships. Graduates and continuing students' responses to these items on the CASEI Student Survey indicate that there was a close match between the philosophy, coursework, and internship experiences (see responses to item #11 parts h and i on the CASEI Student Survey results in Appendix E).

CASEI Competency Rating Scale

As part of the evaluation of the CASEI Project, CASEI students and their employers were mailed the CASEI Competency Rating Scale. This scale lists the competencies that the CASEI courses and field experiences address. The rating scale indicates how well the student rates herself on each competency (with 5 being high competence and 1 being low competence). Employers were asked to rate the student using the same rating scale. The following table indicates the mean ratings that CASEI graduates, continuing students, and employers indicated for the major competency areas covered in the CASEI Project courses and internships. *The return rate for CASEI employers was 61% or 12/18 employers. A copy of the letter to employers and the CASEI Student Competency Rating Scale is included in Appendix D.

CASEI Student Competency Rating Scale
(July, 2001)

Competency Area	CASEI Graduates N=8	CASEI Continuing Students N=4	*CASEI Employers N=12
Normal & atypical development	4.48	4.25	4.33
Knowledge related to families	4.55	4.35	4.43
Knowledge of teamwork	4.37	4.00	4.25
Foundations of EI	4.49	4.33	4.18
Child Assessment	4.33	4.19	4.36
Interventions for children	4.75	4.34	4.38
Evaluation (services to children)	4.67	4.14	4.25
Family Assessment	4.60	4.70	4.37
Intervention for families	4.43	4.60	4.44
Advocacy/Support	4.58	4.75	4.29
Evaluation (services to families)	4.38	4.50	4.25
Team participation & leadership	4.48	4.50	4.40
Organizing service delivery systems	4.30	4.18	4.06
Professional characteristics	4.72	4.77	4.69
Administration & consultation	4.32	4.27	3.94

* One CASEI Project graduate works for two different employers therefore there are 18 total employers but only 17 CASEI Project graduates/students.

This table indicates that CASEI Project graduates and continuing students rate themselves above average on the CASEI Project competencies. The employers of CASEI students also rate them above average on these competencies. It appears that CASEI students are valued employees and that their competence in these areas is high.

CASEI Project Internship Ratings

CASEI students were asked to evaluate their on site internship experiences that were typically completed at their place of employment and to also evaluate their university supervisor. The results of these evaluations have been summarized for this report. The summaries of these evaluations can be found in Appendix F.

3. Conclusion

The CASEI Project officially ended in May, 2001. The goals and objectives of the project were completed in a timely manner. Feedback from the CASEI students indicates that they believe the quality of personnel preparation delivered through this project was exceptionally high. Without the resources provided through this project many students reported they they would not have been able to complete a graduate degree in early childhood special education. Carry-over funds made it possible for most of the CASEI students to complete their M.Ed. degree and continue to work full time in the field of early intervention.

The CASEI Project offers a model for personnel preparation that can address the shortage of highly skilled early interventionists to work with young children with disabilities and their families in rural areas. By structuring practica and coursework in non-traditional ways, the CASEI students were able to work in the field of early intervention and to immediately apply new strategies and ideas learned through coursework. It is clear from the student and employer evaluation data that this project was successful in enhancing the skills and abilities of many early interventionists in Illinois.

References

Odom, S.L. & McLean, M. E. (1996). *Early intervention/early childhood special education: Recommended practices.* Pro-Ed: Austin, TX.

Appendices

Appendix A. CASEI Course Requirements
Consultative and Administrative Content Embedded into Courses (Course/Competency Matrix)
Sample Course Syllabi: SpEd 314, SpEd 466, SpEd 465

Appendix B. Examples of Course Ratings (ICES Ratings)
Student Feedback: SpEd 465 (Internet-based course)

Appendix C. CASEI Student Demographics
Examples of CASEI Internship Forms (IFEP, Time Log, Evaluation Forms)
On-campus Internship Syllabus (SpEd 424I: Parent/Infant Play Group)

Appendix D. CASEI Student Survey, Competency Rating Scale, and Cover Letter
CASEI Employer Competency Rating Scale and Cover Letter

Appendix E. Summary of CASEI Student Survey Results
Summary of CASEI Student Competency Rating Scale Results
Summary of CASEI Employer Competency Rating Scale Results

Appendix F. Summary of CASEI Students' Internship Evaluations
Summary of CASEI Students' Supervisor Evaluations

Appendix A

CASEI Course Requirements

Consultative and Administrative Content Embedded Into Courses (Course/Competency Matrix)

Sample Course Syllabi: SpEd 314, SpEd 466, SpEd 465

COURSE REQUIREMENTS for CASEI MASTER'S STUDENTS
(As of Fall, 1997)

Course Number:	Course Title:	Units:
SPED 314	Assessment	1
SPED 338	Families	1
SPED 424	Internship (on site)	1
SPED 438	Teaming	1
**EPS (300, 302, 303, 309, 310, 311, 312, 314, or 315) EPS (301, 304, 305, 306, 307, or 308)		two ½ unit classes
EDPsy (311, 313, or 314) EDPsy (312, 315, or 316)		two ½ unit classes
SPED 385	Early Development	1
SPED 365	Intervention Methods	1
SPED 466	Organizing for EI	1
SPED 424	Internship (on campus)	½
SPED 465	Atypical Development	½

**Students working toward a master's degree must also meet College requirements in Educational Policy (2 classes, ½ unit each) and Educational Psychology (2 classes, ½ unit each) for an additional two units. These courses can be taken during any semester or by distance learning, depending on availability and student preference. Students should check with the Extramural Programs office (217-244-2030) and/or Educational Psychology (217-333-2245) and Educational Policy (217-333-2446) departments as to course offerings.

Section 3.2 Course/Competency Matrix

Relation of competencies to coursework and type of evaluation
(abbreviated from complete list of program competencies)

Performance Competency	Primary Courses	Application
1.0 Foundation Knowledge		
1.1 Knowledge related to children		
1.1.1 Sequences and processes of normal development	SpEd 385	
1.1.2 Effects of specific disabilities on development.	SpEd 465	
1.1.3 Biological and environmental risk factors	SpEd 385 SpEd 465	
1.1.4 Health, safety, and nutrition	SpEd 385 SpEd 465	
1.1.5 Etiologies, characteristics, and prognoses for disabilities.	SpEd 465	
1.1.6 Typical treatment approaches	SpEd 365 SpEd 465	
1.2 Knowledge related to families		
1.2.1 Historical and current theories	SpEd 338	
1.2.2 Cultural variations	SpEd 338	
1.2.3 Models of stress, support, and coping	SpEd 338	
1.2.4 Influence of at-risk or disabled children on families.	SpEd 338	
1.2.5 Philosophy of family-centered intervention.	SpEd 338	
1.3 Knowledge of teamwork and interpersonal dynamics		
1.3.1 Characteristics of adult learners	SpEd 338 SpEd 438	

1.3.2	Strategies for effective communication.	SpEd 338 SpEd 438
1.3.3	Principles of group dynamics	SpEd 438
1.3.4	Models of service coordination	SpEd 438

1.4 Knowledge related to foundations of early intervention

1.4.1	Moral and legal issues	SpEd 438 SpEd 466
1.4.2	Federal, state, and local rules/regulations	SpEd 438 SpEd 466
1.4.3	Funding and administrative structures	SpEd 438 SpEd 466
1.4.4	State and local agencies	SpEd 438 SpEd 466
1.4.5	History and rationale	SpEd 466
1.4.6	Current issues and research	SpEd 465 SpEd 466 SpEd 385
1.4.7	Principles and practices in evaluation	SpEd 438 SpEd 466
1.4.8	Sources and methods in research	SpEd 338 SpEd 465 SpEd 466 SpEd 385
1.4.9	Theories and practices of integration	SpEd 314 SpEd 365 SpEd 438

2.0 Delivering services to infants, toddlers, and preschoolers

2.1 Assessment

2.1.1	Evaluate reliability/validity of measurement instruments	SpEd 314	
2.1.2	Design measurement plan	SpEd 314	SpEd 424

	2.1.3	Administer, score, interpret norm-referenced tests	SpEd 314	
	2.1.4	Administer score, interpret criterion referenced tests	SpEd 314	SpEd 424
	2.1.5	Gain knowledge in assessments of temperment/ learning style.	SpEd 314	
	2.1.6	Gain knowledge in assessments of attachment, interaction assessments	SpEd 314	
	2.1.7	Administer, score, interpret environmental assessments	SpEd 314	SpEd 424
	2.1.8	Develop interview protocol	SpEd 314 SpEd 338	
	2.1.9	Develop, use, interpret behavioral observation systems	SpEd 314	SpEd 424
	2.1.10	Write assessment reports	SpEd 314	SpEd 424
	2.1.11	Synthesize, interpret information from others	SpEd 314 SpEd 338 SpEd 438	SpEd 424
	2.1.12	Develop sequential analysis of functional levels, strengths, and needs	SpEd 314	SpEd 424
	2.1.13	Share assessment results	SpEd 314 SpEd 338 SpEd 438	SpEd 424
2.2	Intervention			
	2.2.1	Develop intervention/ instructional plan	SpEd 365	SpEd 424
	2.2.2	Develop individual instructional programs	SpEd 365	SpEd 424
	2.2.3	Develop behavior management systems	SpEd 335 SpEd 365	SpEd 424

2.2.4	Design play-focused, functional activities		SpEd 424
2.2.5	Design learning environment	SpEd 365 SpEd 466	SpEd 424
2.2.6	Incorporate resources	SpEd 365	SpEd 424
2.2.7	Use interaction strategies to encourage independence	SpEd 365	SpEd 424
2.2.8	Use responsive intervention strategies	SpEd 365	SpEd 424
2.2.9	Modifying non-productive adult-child interaction.	SpEd 365	SpEd 424
2.2.10	Implement activities as planned		SpEd 424
2.2.11	Use individual and group management techniques	SpEd 335 SpEd 365	SpEd 424
2.2.12	Integrate interdisciplinary strategies	SpEd 365 SpEd 438	SpEd 424
2.2.13	Incorporate special adaptive techniques	SpEd 365	SpEd 424
2.2.14	Match level of child communication	SpEd 365 SPSHS 495	SpEd 424
2.2.15	Support child communication	SpEd 365 SPSHS 495	SpEd 424
2.2.16	Support parent interactions with children.	SpEd 338 SpEd 365 SPSHS 495	SpEd 424
2.3	Evaluation		
2.3.1	Develop systematic data collection plan	SpEd 314 SpEd 365	SpEd 424
2.3.2	Modify spontaneously based on child performance		SpEd 424

	2.3.3	Collect performance data	SpEd 314 SpEd 365	SpEd 424
	2.3.4	Modify plans based on data		SpEd 424
	2.3.5	Summarize child/family progress, update	SpEd 314	SpEd 424
3.0	Delivering services to families			
	3.1	Assessment		
	3.1.1	Involve family members in child assessment	SpEd 314 SpEd 338 SpEd 438	SpEd 424
	3.1.2	Involve family members in discussing implications	SpEd 314 SpEd 338 SpEd 438	SpEd 424
	3.1.3	Plan for strategies to assess family preferences	SpEd 314 SpEd 338	SpEd 424
	3.1.4	Plan for assessing family strengths	SpEd 338	SpEd 424
	3.1.5	Plan for assessing resource and training needs	SpEd 338	SpEd 424
	3.2	Intervention		
	3.2.1	Develop IFSP	SpEd 338 SpEd 365	
	3.2.2	Plan activities with family members		SpEd 424
	3.2.3	Provide information		SpEd 424
	3.2.4	Interpret information from other disciplines.	SpEd 438	SpEd 424
	3.2.5	Use clearly understood language	SpEd 338	SpEd 424
	3.2.6	Use supportive communication techniques	SpEd 338	SpEd 424
	3.2.7	Conduct individual sessions	SpEd 338 SpEd 466	SpEd 424

		3.2.8 Conduct group sessions	SpEd 338	SpEd 424
		3.2.9 Develop home activities	SpEd 365	SpEd 424
	3.3	Advocacy/support		
		3.3.1 Act as advocate in obtaining services	SpEd 438	
		3.3.2 Act as advocate in obtaining funding	SpEd 438	
		3.3.3 Provide resources	SpEd 338	SpEd 424
		3.3.4 Provide support groups	SpEd 338	
		3.3.5 Provide individual support	SpEd 338	SpEd 424
		3.3.6 Provide opportunities for parent linkages	SpEd 338	SpEd 424
	3.4	Evaluation		
		3.4.1 Evaluate program re: individual goals	SpEd 338	SpEd 424
		3.4.2 Evaluate program re: overall family service goals	SpEd 338	SpEd 424
4.0	Team participation and leadership			
	4.1	Know models of team functioning and roles of team members	SpEd 438	
	4.2	Work collaboratively with team	SpEd 438	SpEd 424
	4.3	Provide programmatic updates	SpEd 438	SpEd 424
	4.4	Lead team	SpEd 438	SpEd 424
	4.5	Use group communication/problem-solving techniques.	SpEd 438	SpEd 424
	4.6	Share disciplinary expertise	SpEd 438	SpEd 424
	4.7	Provide peer supervision	SpEd 466	SpEd 424
	4.8	Develop service coordination plan	SpEd 438	SpEd 424

	4.9	Coordinate with other agencies	SpEd 438	SpEd 424
	4.10	Consult re: transition	SpEd 438	SpEd 424
5.0	Organizing service delivery systems			
	5.1	Design variety teaching/ learning environments	SpEd 466	SpEd 424
	5.2	Select materials/equipment	SpEd 365 SpEd 466	SpEd 424
	5.3	Outline family service options	SpEd 338	
	5.4	Organize time, space, adults	SpEd 466	SpEd 424
	5.5	Outline alternative team structures	SpEd 438	SpEd 424
	5.6	Provide public relations activities		SpEd 424
	5.7	Evaluate program re: overall service, goals of program	SpEd 466	SpEd 424
6.0	Professional characteristics			
	6.1	Demonstrate enthusiasm/enjoyment		SpEd 424
	6.2	Demonstrate professional work habits		SpEd 424
	6.3	Demonstrate flexibility		SpEd 424
	6.4	Demonstrate clear communication		SpEd 424
	6.5	Reflect concern for worth of others		SpEd 424
	6.6	Adhere to professional standards		SpEd 424
	6.7	Adhere to policies/procedures		SpEd 424
	6.8	Participate in professional organizations		SpEd 424
	6.9	Seek professional growth experiences		SpEd 424
	6.10	Use current literature		SpEd 424
	6.11	Show poise in difficult situations		SpEd 424
	6.12	Self-evaluation of collaboration		SpEd 424

CASEI Project

Administration and Consultation Course Competency Matrix
(abbreviated from the list of CASEI Program competencies)

Performance Competency	Primary Courses	Application
7.0 Administration and Consultation		
7.1 Demonstrate leadership skills	SpEd 438 SpEd 466	SpEd 424I
7.2 Design staff performance evaluation	SpEd 466	SpEd 424I
7.3 Facilitate staff performance and growth through opportunities for in-service support, development of in-services, and peer mentoring	SpEd 466 SpEd 314 SpEd 465	SpEd 424I
7.4 Design effective staff selection and hiring	SpEd 466	SpEd 424I
7.5 Collaboratively develop shared philosophy statements, program standards, and goals with other staff and families practices	SpEd 314 SpEd 466 SpEd 365	SpEd 424I
7.6 Demonstrate the ability to manage the early intervention program through day to day organizational support	SpEd 466	SpEd 424I
7.7 Develop and write grant proposals	SpEd 466	SpEd 424I
7.8 Represent the program to other community agencies and facilitate linkages to other community agencies and programs	SpEd 438	SpEd 424I
7.9 Engage in effective consultation skills during meetings with families and other professionals to carry out program activities	SpEd 314 SpEd 466	SpEd 424I

SpEd 314:
Applications in Assessment of Young Children with Special Needs
Fall 1998; 8:30-4:30 Saturday
(9/12, 9/19, 10/3, 10/17, 10/24, 11/7 and snow day = 11/21)

Instructors:	Micki Ostrosky	Barb Phillips	Susan Yorde
Office:	276c Education	270 Education	284 Education
Telephone:	333-0260 (office)	333-0260 (office)	333-0260 (office)
Office Hours:	1:00-3:00 Thursdays*	10:30-12:30 Monday*	8:00-10:00 Wednesday *
E-Mail:	ostrosky@uiuc.edu	bphillps@uiuc.edu	yorde@uiuc.edu

* or by appointment

Required Readings:

McLean, M., Bailey, D. B., & Wolery, M. (1996). Assessing infants and preschoolers with special needs. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill

Supplemental readings are available at UpClose Printing, 714 South Sixth Street, 384-7474.

If you need accommodations for any sort of physical or learning disability, please see the instructors.

Rationale and Purpose of the Course:

Assessment is the cornerstone of instructional practices in special education. Professionals working with infants and children with special needs must be prepared to identify assessment instruments and procedures that are appropriate, to evaluate the adequacy of the assessment instruments, and to use the information for multiple purposes (e.g., identifying specific disabling conditions, instructional programming, or evaluating progress). In addition, professionals in special education must be able to communicate the assessment information that they collect in a manner that can be understood by professionals from other disciplines and by parents.

The purpose of this course is to provide an overview of assessment practices in early intervention programs. Students will gain knowledge of a variety of approaches to assessment. The limitations of selected assessment practices and problems of interpretation inherent to early childhood will be addressed. Students will gain skill in administering assessments and in interpreting information from testing and observation for the purpose of planning intervention. Attention will be paid to the significant role of families in the assessment process, both as informants with regard to their young children, and as co-participants and planners in the assessment process.

Objectives:

Course readings, activities, discussions and related field experiences will enable students to:

1. discuss the different purposes for which assessment information is used, and describe limitations of different approaches to measurement;
2. evaluate reliability, validity, and appropriateness of measurement instruments and procedures for specific assessment and intervention purposes;
3. interpret norm-referenced tests across developmental domains;
4. administer, score, and interpret curriculum/criterion-referenced tests across developmental domains;

5. perform an arena assessment that includes a family member as part of the assessment team;
6. perform, and interpret assessment information obtained from a play-based assessment;
7. administer, score, and interpret assessments of caregiving and classroom environments for their potential to facilitate child development and learning.
8. adapt assessment strategies in order to obtain optimal information about young children with special needs;
9. integrate assessment results in order that other professionals and the family can make decisions related to developing a comprehensive intervention plan.
10. write well organized, factual, and useful assessment reports;
11. develop an analysis of concerns and priorities in developmental and behavioral areas, based on assessment results; and
12. develop a family-friendly plan for gathering assessment information appropriate to each step in the assessment process.

Course Schedule and Reading Assignments:

September 12
Introductions
Course Requirements
Introduction to Measurement:
Measurement References in the Law
Issues in Assessing Young Children with Special Needs
Norm-Referenced Assessments
Psychometric Properties
Infant and Early Childhood Screening
Readings: Chapters 1, 2, 3, 5 & 6
Greenspan & Meisels (1996)
Hoy & Gregg (1994)

September 19 A Family-Centered Approach to Assessment
Summarizing Information with Parents
Transdisciplinary Play-Based Assessment
Steps in Assessment Planning and Evaluation
Plan for Assessment Lab
Readings: Chapter 4 & 8
Bagnato & Neisworth (1991)
Kjerland & Kovach (1990)
Linder; chapters 2 & 3 (1993)
Myers, McBride, & Peterson (1996)
Winton (1988)
Psychometric Assignment Due

October 3
TPBA Lab; location TBA
Team Summary: Using Assessment Information for Planning
Team Evaluation of the Assessment Process
Environmental Assessment: Group Settings, Individual Settings
Readings: Chapter 9
McWilliam & Bailey (1995)
Screening Assignment Due

October 17
Observation and Observational Methods
Curriculum-Based Assessments
Monitoring Child Progress
Team Preparation for AEPS Assessment Lab
Readings: Chapters 7, 11,12 & 17
Murphy (1990)
Schwartz & Olswang (1996)
TPBA Reaction Paper Due
Family Routines Interview Due

October 24
AEPS Lab; location TBA
Team Summary: Using Assessment Information for Planning
Team Evaluation of the Assessment Process
Report Writing: Linking Assessment and Intervention
Readings: Chapters 13, 14, 15, & 16
Environmental Assessment Assignment Due

November 7
Assessing Specific Areas of Development
Ordinal Tests
Adapting Assessment Approaches to Individual Children
Assessment Process Revisited
Trends on the Field
Wrap-Up/Course Evaluations
Readings: Chapter 10
Fewell (1991)
Mahoney, Spiker, & Boyce (1996)
McCollum (1984)
AEPS Reaction Paper Due

December 11 **Curriculum-Based Assessment and Summary Assignment Due**

Course Assignments:

A. A Comprehensive Assessment Approach

This assignment is comprised of four parts, and is designed to assist you in using multiple data sources to build a comprehensive, intervention-relevant picture of one child and his/her developmental and learning environments. Each assignment therefore will be done with the same child with special needs and his/her family. Although each part will be graded separately, the four will be cumulative, with the last assignment requiring that you bring all of the information together in thinking about recommendations fof intervention. Detailed guidelines for preparing each assignment will be distributed in class 1-2 weeks before each assignment is due.

1. Family Routines Interview: Students will utilize an interview or conversational format to obtain information about a family's daily routines with the child, as well as about their priorities and concerns with regard to those routines. Each student will summarize the results of this assessment, including at least 2 recommendations.

2. Environmental Assessment: Students should select or design one environmental inventory. This inventory may be a formal instrument established by others, or may be designed by the student to measure a specific aspect of an individual's environment.

Students should use this instrument to measure specific characteristics of an environment such as the child's school, home, or community. Students will describe these inventories and summarize their assessment in a report which will include recommendations for intervention.

3. Curriculum-Based Assessment and Report: Students will select a curriculum-based assessment to use; **part of this assessment must be videotaped for use in #4 (below).** Each student will administer the assessment and then write an assessment report that includes strengths, concerns, and priorities, as well as a minimum of 2 recommendations for the child/family.

4. Summary and Critique: For the final part of this assignment, the student will (a) draw conclusions with regard to strengths, needs, priorities, and recommendations based on all information gathered, (b) compare and critique the three methods used to gather information; and (c) critique his/her own test-giving behavior, using the videotape done in #3.

B. Other Course Requirements

Screening Report: Students will administer a screening instrument to a typically developing child or a child with suspected delays (birth-6) and write up the results. Students are to critique the usefulness of the screening tool and evaluate themselves as examiners.

Reaction Papers: After students have administered the Play-Based Assessment and the AEPS during class they will react to: the usefulness of each assessment instrument, the process, and themselves as examiners. Questions to guide these short papers will be provided in class the week before they are due.

Psychometric Properties: A take-home quiz on psychometric properties will be passed out one week before it is due.

Grading: Total Course Points = 200

Family Routines Interview	30 Points
Environmental Assessment	30
Curriculum-Based Assessment Report	30
Summary and Critique	40
Screening Report	20
Reaction Papers (2 at 15 points each)	30
Psychometric Assignment	05

Grade Allocation	172-185	= A (93-100%)
	156-171	= B (84-92%)
	139-155	= C (75-83%)

References

Bagnato, S. J., & Neisworth, J. T. (1991). Assessment for early intervention: Best practices for professionals. NY: Guilford Press.

Fewell, R. C. (1991). Trends in the assessment of infants and toddlers with disabilities. Exceptional Children, 58(2), 166-173.

Greenspan, S. I. & Meisels, S. J. (1996). Toward a new vision for the developmental assessment of infants and young children. In S. J. Meisels & E. Fenichel (Eds.), New Visions for the Developmental Assessment of Infants and Young Children. Washington, DC: ZERO TO THREE.

Hoy, C. & Gregg, N. (1994). Assessment The Special Educator's Role. California: Brooks/Cole.

Kjerland, L., & Kovach, J. (1990). Family-staff collaboration for tailored infant assessment. In E. D. Gibbs & D. M. Teti (Eds.), Interdisciplinary assessment of infants: A guide for early intervention professionals. Baltimore: Brookes.

Linder, T. W. (1993). Transdisciplinary play-based assessment (pp. 9-37). Baltimore: Brookes.

Mahoney, G., Spiker, D., & Boyce, G. (1996). Clinical assessments of parent-child interaction: Are professionals ready to implement this practice? Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 16(1), 26-50.

McCollum, J. (1984). Parenting an infant with a disability. Exceptional Parent, 45-50.

McWilliam, R. A. & Bailey, D. B. (1995). Effects of classroom social structure and disability on engagement. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 15(2), 123-147.

Murphy, A. (1990). Communicating assessment findings to parents. In E. D. Gibbs & D. M. Teti (Eds.), Interdisciplinary assessment of infants (pp. 299-307). Baltimore: Brookes.

Myers, C. L., McBride, S. L., & Peterson, C. A. (1996). Transdisciplinary, play-based assessment in early childhood special education: An examination of social validity. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 16(1), 102-126.

Schwartz, I. S. & Olswang, L. B. (1996). Evaluating child behavior change in natural settings: Exploring alternative strategies for data collection. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 16(1), 82-101.

Winton, P. J. (1988). The family-focused interview: An assessment measure and goal-setting mechanism. In D. B. Bailey & R. J. Simeonsson (Eds.), Family assessment in early intervention (pp. 185-205). Columbus: Merrill.

December 17, 1997

Dear Students,

We look forward to seeing you on our first day of class for **Special Education 466, Early Childhood Special Education: Organizing for Early Intervention**. We appreciate your help in sending back the needs assessment. With your input, we were able to plan readings, presentations, activities, and assignments to address the topics you indicated were most important to you in the field of early intervention. Enclosed is the course syllabus as well as information about the local bookstores and copy shop where you can purchase the reading materials for the course.

The first class will meet on **Saturday, January 24, 1998, from 8:30-4:30 in Room 242 Education Building**. In order for you to be prepared for the first class, you will need to read:

1. Chapter 1 and the appendix (DEC Recommended Practices) in the Odom and McLean textbook
2. IDEA information: a reauthorized IDEA is enacted (ISBE booklet June, 1997)
3. Two articles in the Up-Close packet (Espinosa ,1995; Walker, 1978)

You can purchase the textbook at any one of the bookstores on the attached page. If you call Up-Close Printing and send them a check for the readings plus priority mail postage, they will send the readings to you. If you have any questions prior to the first day of class please contact either one of us at the phone numbers listed on the syllabus.

We look forward to seeing all of you in January!

Sincerely,

Bernie Laumann Rob Corso

SpEd 466:
Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE): Organizing for Early Intervention
Spring 1998

Instructors:	Bernie Laumann	and	Rob Corso
Office:	288b Education		Rm. 97 Children's Research Center
Telephone:	(217) 333-0260 (O)		(217) 333-4123 (O)
	(217) 328-2708 (H)		(217) 344-9043 (H)
E-mail:	blaumann@uiuc.edu		rcorso@students.uiuc.edu
Office Hours:	By Appointment		By Appointment

Class Time and Location: College of Education Room 242.
8:30-4:30 Saturday: Jan. 24, Feb. 7, Feb. 21, March 7, April 18, April 25, May 2 (snow day)

Please Note: If you need to be contacted during class time calls can be made directly to Bernie's voice mail number (217/244-3365).

Required Readings:

Odom, S.L., & McLean, M.E. (Eds.). (1996). Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education Recommended Practices. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

A book of readings available at UpClose Printing at 714 S. Sixth St. (phone 217-384-7474). You can call UpClose and send them a check or pay by credit card for the readings and postage. They will then mail the readings to you.

If you need any special accommodations please see the course instructors.

Rationale and Purpose of the Course:

The purpose of this course is to provide an overview of issues and research in relation to the efficacy of various program models for young children with special needs. Course content will cover programs designed for infants, toddlers and young children with special needs with particular emphasis given to the role of the administrator within the early childhood special education environment.

Individuals in leadership roles (i.e., coordinator, supervisor) have the potential to bring about change. In this course, assigned readings, lectures, discussions, and activities will address how you can effect change through grant writing, supervision, consultation, inservice training, legislation, and observation.

Objectives:

Course readings, activities, discussions, and related field experiences will enable students to meet the following objectives.

Students will demonstrate knowledge of:

a.) state and federal legislation and policy related to early childhood special education
b.) administrative structure of early childhood special education
c.) models of service delivery in early childhood special education
d.) service delivery and outcome issues in early childhood special education

Students will demonstrate knowledge of and skill in:

a.) evaluating and designing transition processes
b.) providing supervision of other adults
c.) conducting inservice training
d.) developing and evaluating grant proposals
e.) evaluating physical and social environments that support learning and development
f.) professional behaviors and attitudes in early childhood special education

Course Schedule and Reading Assignments:

January 24th: Introduction
Course requirements
Developing a personal and program philosophy
The clinical supervision model
Student in-service topics

READINGS: Odom & McLean (Chapter 1 and the Appendix: DEC Recommended Practices)
IDEA information (ISBE booklet June, 1997)
Espinosa (1995)
Walker (1978)

February 7th: Legislation
Writing grants/evaluating grants
In-service preparation

READINGS: Guralnick (1997)
Grantwriting Workshop (1996)
Hanson (1992)
***Reaction Paper #1 Due**
***Web Link Assignment Due**

February 21st: Working with paraprofessional staff & other personnel issues
Strategies for effective consultation
In-service preparation

READINGS: NAEYC Code of Ethics (1990)
Garland & Linder (1994)
Friend & Cook (1996)
DEC Personnel Standards (1996)
***Inservice Outline Due**
***Reaction Paper #2 Due**

March 7th: Program models/efficacy
Program evaluation
In-service preparation

R EADINGS: Stayton & Karnes (1994)
Odom & McLean (Chapter 12)
Wesley (1994)
***Reaction Paper #3 Due**
***Resource Manual/Notebook**

April 18th: Early Intervention in Illinois
Student inservice presentations

READINGS: Fowler, Hains, & Rosenkoetter (1990)
Odom & McLean (Chapter 5)
Student selected readings for in-services
***Grant Proposal Assignment Due**

April 25th : Student inservice presentations
Review course content/summary
Course evaluation

READINGS: Student selected readings for inservices
***Peer Supervision Assignment Due**

****Program Observation Assignment Due Thursday, May 7th**

Course Assignments:

Reaction Papers: Students will be given a brief list of questions that will be the basis for a brief (no more than 3-5 double spaced pages) position paper. The purpose of these reaction papers is to help integrate material read and discussed in class. These papers will also assist students in clarifying their personal philosophies/beliefs about early childhood special education.

Web Site Assignment: Students will be required to use the internet to locate a web site that contains information that is of value to professionals and/or parents involved in the field of early intervention. Students will bring a document/information obtained from that web site to class and report on what they have learned. All students' web site documents will be compiled and copied as a resource for the other students in the class.

Peer Supervision: This assignment includes application of the clinical supervision model and procedures discussed during class as well as an evaluation of your supervision session. Students will work in pairs and conduct pre-observation conference, observation of peer engaged in teaching or working in an EI setting, and post-observation conference. Each student will evaluate his/her role as a supervisor. Included in the assignment should be notes and data taken during the observation. Strengths and areas of improvement should be noted, not only for the supervisee, but for the supervisor.

Program Observation: This assignment is designed to allow you to complete an in-depth observation of early intervention settings or preschools with which you may not be familiar. These will include one birth -to three, and one 3-5 setting. You will complete an observation/ interview schedule for each visit and write a summary of each visit.

Grant Proposal: Students will design a grant proposal that could be implemented in an early childhood setting. A rationale, method section, and evaluation plan are required. This assignment will be altered to fit the student's current level of expertise in the area of grant writing. Students proficient in grant writing may choose an alternative assignment.

Inservice Presentation: Students will work in groups to conduct an inservice presentation to the class. These inservices will take place during the final two class meetings and should be 60 min. in length. Each group should share a reference list on their topic with the class. Inservice handouts should be a maximum of 10 pages.

Resource Manual/Notebook: Students will collect and organize information from class readings, handouts, inservice presentations , and discussion notes to develop an administrative resource manual/notebook that can be used as a personal reference at their current or a future work site.

Grading:

Web Site Document	10 points
Reaction Papers (3 at 15 points each)	45 points
Peer Supervision	20 points
Program Observations (2 at 15 points each)	30 points
Grant Proposal	40 points
Inservice Presentation	60 points
Resource Manual/Notebook	10 points

Grade Allocation:	196-215	= A
	176-195.9	= B
	157-175.9	= C

SpEd 466 Course Assignments
Due Dates:

February 7th:	**Reaction Paper #1** **Web Link Assignment**
February 21st:	**Inservice Outline** **Reaction Paper #2**
March 7th:	**Reaction Paper #3** **Resource Manual/Notebook**
April 18th:	**Grant Proposal Assignment** **Some Inservice Presentations**
April 25th:	**Some Inservice Presentations** **Peer Supervision Assignment**
May 7th:	**Program Observation Assignment**

SpEd 465
Atypical Development in Young Children
Summer 1998

Instructors:	Helen Bair Heal, PhD.	and	Bernie Laumann
Office:	#61 Children's Research Center		288b Education
Telephone:	(217) 333-4123 (O)		(217) 333-0260 (O) (217) 328-2708 (H)
E-mail:	p-bair@uiuc.edu		blaumann@uiuc.edu
Fax:			(217) 333-6555
Office Hours:	By Appointment		By Appointment

Class Time and Location: College of Education Room 242.
8:30-4:30 Saturday: June 6, 13, 20
8:30-2:30 Saturday: July 11 (Open Class Session)

Please Note: If you need to be contacted during class time calls can be made directly to Bernie's voice mail number (217/244-3365).

Class Attendance and Participation: Attendance in class for the entire day is expected. If you are not attending due to illness or catastrophe, please call one of us prior to the session.

Required Readings:

1. A book of readings available at UpClose Printing: 714 S. Sixth St. Champaign, IL. 61820 (phone: 217/384-7474). If you live out of town you can call UpClose and send them a check or pay by credit card for the readings and postage. They will then mail the readings to you. The readings will be available on May 18th.

2. In addition, individual readings will be assigned based on individually assigned topics.

If you need any special accommodations please see the course instructors.

Rationale and Purpose of the Course:

The purpose of this course is to introduce students to conditions that place young children at developmental risk, including conditions in the child, in the child's environment, and in the interactions between child and environment. Developmental and intervention implications of these conditions are emphasized.

Course Objectives:

1. Knowledge of theoretical and research models for understanding the development of young children with disabilities and other conditions of developmental risk.

2. Knowledge of environmental and biological risk factors and their potential effects on early development.

3. Knowledge of symptomatology and etiology of common disabling and medical conditions in very young children and their potential effects on early development.

4. Understanding of interrelationships among domains of development, and implications for young children with disabilities and other conditions of developmental risk.

5. Ability to use resources and information tools to obtain information on early development of young children with disabilities and other conditions of developmental risk.

6. Knowledge of common approaches to prevention and intervention for young children with various disabilities or other biological and environmental conditions placing them at developmental risk.

7. Awareness of ethical and policy issues related to educational, social service, and medical interventions with young children and their families.

Course Schedule and Reading Assignments:

June 6th:

Introduction
Course requirements
Studying atypical development
Determinants and outcomes of risk:
  a) environmental effects
  b) risks and resilience
  c) biological risk

READINGS:

Shore (1997) (mailed to you with the syllabus)
Halpern (1993)
Schorr (1988)
Thurman & Gonsalves (1993)
Howard, Williams, Port, & Lepper (1997)
***Study Questions Based on the Readings**

June 13:

NICU visit
Potential outcomes of prenatal, natal, and postnatal risk

READINGS:

Howard, Williams, Port, & Lepper (1997)
Als & Gilkerson (1995)
VandenBerg & Hanson (1993)
Cooper & Kennedy (1989)
Harris, Atwater, & Crowe (1988)
Heriza & Sweeney (1995)
Neisworth, Bagnato, & Salvia (1995)
Thomas & Tidmarsh (1997)
***Study Questions Based on the Readings**

June 20:

Attachment, Interaction, and Emotion
Developmental Effects of Disabilities
Student Lead Poster Session

READINGS:

Zeanah, Mammen, & Lieberman (1993)
Thomasgard & Shonkoff (1993)
Msall, DiGaudio, & Malone (1991)
Brunquell (1994)
Johnson (1993)
Hutchinson & Sandall (1995)
Gatty (1996)
Teplin (1995)
Volkmar (1993)
Valluzi, Brown, & Dailey (1997)
***Study Questions Based on the Readings**
***Poster Presentation**
*** Resource List for Families or Professionals**

July 11:

Open Class Session
The instructors have scheduled this open session for any students who wish to discuss assignments, review course materials, or turn in assignments for feedback and editing.

****Last Set of Study Questions due: 7/11/98**
****Video Reviews due: 7/11/98**

Students enrolled in this class for one unit of credit will complete these additional assignments:

***NICU Visit Reaction Paper: due 7/17/98**

***Interview with a Professional in Your Field of Study: due 7/17/98**

Course Assignments:

1. Study Questions: Because this class will be run primarily in a seminar format, it is important that everyone prepare for and participate in class. We are asking that for each of the class sessions, student complete a written set of questions for each of the readings for that class. These will be provided by the instructors and will be used as a focus for class discussion. They will be collected at the end of class on June 6th and 13th. The last set of study questions will be due on July 11th.

2. Resource List for Families and Professionals: Each student will choose (and/or be assigned) an area of disability and will be responsible for finding and bringing to class certain resources for professionals and families regarding the particular disability. Resources will include organizations (names, addresses, phone numbers, web site address, and description of membership and services provided). The resource list should be compiled from national, state, and local resources that families or professionals might contact for information and support. Provide copies of your resource list for your classmates.

3. Poster Session: Students will work in pairs to develop a poster session about a particular disability. The poster will include the definition or descriptive information about the disability, the effects the disability has on development, and the implications for practice. Each student will complete a two page paper about the disability which will be used as a handout for classmates.

4. Video Summaries: Each student will choose six videos from a selection of nine to review one at a time. A written synthesis of each tape will be prepared (1-2 typed pages) to include: (a). a brief summary of the major points of the videotape; (b). major insights that you gained; and c. information obtained that you believe all individuals working with children with special needs should know.

Students taking this class for one full unit of credit will complete the following two additional assignments:

5. NICU Reaction Paper: Students will write a reaction paper about their observation at the NICU. This paper will include the student's developmental observation of a premature infant.

6. Interview with a Professional in Your Field of Study: Students will contact and interview a professional currently working in their field of study. The interview will include questions pertaining to the rewards and challenges of working with young children with special needs and their families. **Students should make contact with the professional before June 1st to ensure the feasibility of completing this assignment during the summer.** The instructors will expect the students to bring the name of their professional contact to class on June 6th. The student will write a paper (minimum of five pages) summarizing their interview with the professional.

Grading:

Study Questions	110 points
Resource List	15 points
Poster Session/Paper	90 points
Video Summaries	60 points

****

NICU Reaction Paper	40 points
Interview Paper	60 points

Grade Allocation:

½ Unit:	248-275	= A
	220-247.9	= B
	193-219.9	= C
1 Unit:	338-375	= A
	300-337.9	= B
	263-299.9	= C

SpEd 465 Course Assignments
Due Dates:

June 6th:	**Study Questions** *** Name of Professional Contact for Interview Assignment**
June 13th:	**Study Questions**
June 20th:	**Poster Presentation** **Resource List for Families and Professionals**
July 11th:	**Last Set of Study Questions** **Video Reviews**
July 17th:	***NICU Reaction Paper** ***Interview with a Professional in Your Field of Study**

***Indicates assignments for students taking the course for one unit of graduate credit**

SPED 465 Readings
Summer 1998

Session 1: Determinants of Risk (Environmental, Biological)

Halpern, R. (1993). Poverty and infant development. In C. H. Zeanah, Jr. (Ed.). Handbook of infant mental health. (pp. 73-86). New York: Guilford Press.

Schorr, E. (1988). Within our reach. New York: Doubleday. (Chapter 2)

Thurman, S. K., & Gonsalves, S. V. (1993). Adolescent mothers and their premature infants:Responding to double risk. Infants and Young Children, 5 , 44-51.

Howard, V.F., Williams, B.F., Port, P. D., & Lepper, C. (1997). Very young children with special needs: A formative approach for the 21st century. New Jersey:Prentice Hall (Merrill). (Inborn variations of development; pp. 183-238)

The following reading is NOT in UpClose packet; you received it previously:
Shore, Rima (1997). Rethinking the brain. New York: Families and Work Institute.

Session 2: The NICU Experience;
Potential Outcomes of Prenatal, Natal, and Postnatal Risk

Howard, V.F., Williams, B.F., Port, P. D., & Lepper, C. (1997). Very young children with special needs: A formative approach for the 21st century. New Jersey:Prentice Hall (Merrill). (Development and Risking Conditions: Prenatal, Natal, and Postnatal; pp. 115-147)

Als, H., & Gilkerson, L. (1995). Developmentally supportive care in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. Zero to Three, 15 (6), pp. 1 - 10.

VandenBerg, K.A., & Hanson, M.J. (1993). Homecoming for babies after the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit: A guide for professionals in supporting families and their infants' early development. Austin, TX: Pro-ed. (The infant's experience in the NICU)

Cooper, C. & Kennedy, R. (1989). An update for professionals working with neonates at risk. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 9 (3), pp. 32-50.

Harris, S., Atwater, S. & Crowe, T. (1988). Accepted and controversial neuromotor therapies for infants at high risk for cerebral palsy. Journal of Perinatology, VIII, (1), pp. 3 - 12.

Heriza, C. B., & Sweeney, J. K. (1995). Pediatric physical therapy: Part II. Approaches to movement dysfunction. Infants and Young Children, 8 (2), pp. 1-14.

Neisworth, J. T., Bagnato, S. J., & Salvia, J. (1995). Neurobehavioral markers for early regulatory disorders. Infants and Young Children, 8(1), pp. 8 -17.

Thomas, J. M. & Tidmarsh, L. (1997). Hyperactive and disruptive behaviors in very young children: Diagnosis and intervention. Infants and Young Children, 9(3), pp. 46-55.

Session 3: Attachment, Interaction and Emotion;
Developmental Effects of Disabilities

Zeanah, C. H., Mammen, O. K., & Lieberman, A. F. (1993). Disorders of attachment. In C.H. Zeanah, Jr. (Ed). Handbook of infant mental health. (pp.332-349) New York: Guilford Press.

Thomasgard, M. & Shonkoff, J. P. (1993). Mental retardation. In C.H. Zeanah, Jr. (Ed). Handbook of infant mental health. (pp.332-349) New York: Guilford Press.

Msall, M. E., DiGaudio, K. M. & Malone, A. F. (1991). Health, developmental, and psychosocial aspects of Down syndrome. Infants and Young Children, 4(1), pp. 35-45.

Brunquell, P. (1994). Listening to epilepsy. Infants and Young Children, 7(1), pp. 24-33.

Johnson, C. B. (1993). Developmental issues: Children infected with the human immunodeficiency virus. Infants and Young Children, 6(1), pp. 1-10.

Hutchinson, M. K., & Sandall, S. R. (1995). Congenital TORCH infections in infants and young children: Neurodevelopmental sequalae and implications for intervention. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 15(1), pp. 65-82.

Gatty, J. C. (1996). Early intervention and management of hearing in infants and toddlers. Infants and Young Children, 9(1), pp. 1-15.

Teplin, S. W. (1995). Visual impairment in infants and young children. Infants and Young Children, 8(1), pp. 18-51.

Volkmar, F. R. (1993).Autism and the pervasive developmental disorders. In C.H. Zeanah, Jr. (Ed). Handbook of infant mental health. (pp.236-251) New York: Guilford Press.

Valluzi, J. L., Brown, S. E., & Dailey, B. (1997). Protecting the rights of children with special health care needs through the development of individualized emergency response plans. Infants and Young Children, 10(2), pp. 66-80.

Appendix B

Examples of Course Ratings (ICES Ratings)

Student Feedback: SpEd 465 (Internet-based course)

INSTRUCTOR REPORT

FOR: M. OSTROSKY DEPT SPED COURSE 314 SECTION 007 DEPT CODE 20350 SEMESTER: FALL YEAR: 1998

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA IN PERCENTS BASED ON 23 COMPLETED FORMS

1. CLASS STATUS

FRESH	SOPH	JUNIOR	SENIOR	GRAD	OTHER	OMIT
0	0	0	9	70	17	4

2. PRE-COURSE OPINION TOWARD:

	POS	NO OP	NEG	OMIT
INSTRUCTOR	74	22	0	4
COURSE	61	30	4	4

3. THIS COURSE WAS DESIGNATED REQUIRED

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED	REQUIRED BUT A CHOICE	ELECTIVE	OMIT
70	0	22	9

4. COURSE IN

MAJOR	MINOR	OTHER	OMIT
52	0	39	9

5. SEX: MALE 0 FEMALE 83 OMIT 17

6. EXPECTED GRADE: MEAN = 4.8

A	B	C	D	E	OMIT
65	17	0	0	0	17

INSTRUCTOR DESIGNATED CLASS TYPE: TEAM TAUGHT

OPTIONAL ITEMS--CATEGORIES

	1	2	3	4	5	OMIT
ITEM A	0	0	0	0	0	100
ITEM B	0	0	0	0	0	100

GLOBAL CORE ITEM RESULTS — PERCENTS WITH FREQUENCIES BENEATH

ITEM	EXCEPTIONALLY HIGH-5	4	3	2	EXCEPTIONALLY LOW-1	OMIT	SUMMARY STATISTICS MEAN	STD DEV
1. RATE THE INSTRUCTOR'S OVERALL TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS	91 (21)	4 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (1)	5.0	0.2
2. RATE THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THIS COURSE	43 (10)	48 (11)	4 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (1)	4.4	0.6

COMPARISON OF MEAN RATING

ROW 1: HIGH REQ/ FACULTY
ROW 2: SPECIAL ED.

LOW	LOW AVG	AVG	HI AVG	HI
1				OX
2				OOOXO
1		OOXOO		
2		OOOXOOOO		

INTERPRETATION GUIDE FOR COMPARISON OF MEANS

THE CLASS MEAN RATING IS COMPARED WITH ONE OR TWO GROUPS. GROUP 1 (ROW 1 FOR EACH ITEM) IS CAMPUS-WIDE BASED ON REQUIRED/ELECTIVE NATURE OF COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR RANK. GROUP 2 (ROW 2) IS DEPARTMENT-WIDE. THE CLASS MEAN (THE 'X') IS DENOTED UNDER ONE OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE NORM CATEGORIES:

HI - HIGHEST 10%
HI AVG - NEXT 20%
AVG - MIDDLE 40%
'OW AVG - NEXT 20%
OW - LOWEST 10%

EACH ROW CONTAINING AN X AND SEVERAL O'S SHOWS THE CLASS AVERAGE RATING IN COMPARISON TO GROUPS 1 AND 2. X INDICATES THE RELATIVE PLACEMENT OF THE MEAN. O'S INDICATE THE RANGE OF UNCERTAINTY. THE RATINGS SHOULD BE READ, FOR EXAMPLE, AS LOW-AVERAGE TO AVERAGE OR HIGH-AVERAGE TO HIGH TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE RANGE OF UNCERTAINTY.

STUDENT RESPONSES TO DEPARTMENTAL CORE ITEMS, STUDENT CORE ITEMS, INSTRUCTOR SELECTED ITEMS, OR COMPLETE FORM ITEMS " PRESENTED NEXT. THE RESULTS ARE TO BE INTERPRETED IN . SAME WAY. HOWEVER, NORMATIVE DATA MAY NOT BE AVAILABLE.

INSTRUCTOR REPORT

FOR: B LAUMANN DEPT SPED COURSE 466 SECTION 80 DEPT CODE 20350 SEMESTER: SPNG YEAR: 1998

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA IN PERCENTS BASED ON 21 COMPLETED FORMS

1. CLASS STATUS

FRESH	SOPH	JUNIOR	SENIOR	GRAD	OTHER	OMIT
0	0	0	0	95	0	5

2. PRE-COURSE OPINION TOWARD:

	POS	NO OP	NEG	OMIT
INSTRUCTOR	76	19	0	5
COURSE	52	43	0	5

3. THIS COURSE WAS DESIGNATED REQUIRED

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED	REQUIRED BUT A CHOICE	ELECTIVE	OMIT
90	0	5	5

4. COURSE IN:

MAJOR	MINOR	OTHER	OMIT
81	0	14	5

5. SEX: MALE FEMALE OMIT

5 90 5

6. EXPECTED GRADE: MEAN = 5.0

A	B	C	D	E	OMIT
90	5	0	0	0	5

INSTRUCTOR DESIGNATED CLASS TYPE: LECTURE/DISCUSSION

OPTIONAL ITEMS--CATEGORIES

	1	2	3	4	5	OMIT
ITEM A	0	0	0	0	0	100
ITEM B	0	0	0	0	0	100

GLOBAL CORE ITEM RESULTS — PERCENTS WITH FREQUENCIES BENEATH

ITEM	EXCEPTIONALLY HIGH-5	4	3	2	LOW-1	OMIT	SUMMARY STATISTICS MEAN	STD DEV		COMPARISON OF MEAN RATING (ROW 1: HIGH REQ/ FACULTY; ROW 2: SPECIAL ED.) LOW | LOW AVG | AVG | HI AVG | HI
1. RATE THE INSTRUCTOR'S OVERALL TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS	57 (12)	33 (7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (2)	4.6	0.5	1	OOXOO
									2	OOXOOO
2. RATE THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THIS COURSE	43 (9)	43 (9)	5 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (2)	4.4	0.6	1	OOXOO
									2	OOXOO

INTERPRETATION GUIDE FOR COMPARISON OF MEANS

THE CLASS MEAN RATING IS COMPARED WITH ONE OR TWO GROUPS. GROUP 1 (ROW 1 FOR EACH ITEM) IS CAMPUS-WIDE BASED ON REQUIRED/ELECTIVE NATURE OF COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR RANK. GROUP 2 (ROW 2) IS DEPARTMENT-WIDE. THE CLASS MEAN (THE 'X') IS DENOTED UNDER ONE OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE NORM CATEGORIES:

HI - HIGHEST 10%
HI AVG - NEXT 20%
AVG - MIDDLE 40%
OW AVG - NEXT 20%
OW - LOWEST 10%

EACH ROW CONTAINING AN X AND SEVERAL O'S SHOWS THE CLASS AVERAGE RATING IN COMPARISON TO GROUPS 1 AND 2. X INDICATES THE RELATIVE PLACEMENT OF THE MEAN. O'S INDICATE THE RANGE OF UNCERTAINTY. THE RATINGS SHOULD BE READ, FOR EXAMPLE, AS LOW-AVERAGE TO AVERAGE OR HIGH-AVERAGE TO HIGH TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE RANGE OF UNCERTAINTY.

STUDENT RESPONSES TO DEPARTMENTAL CORE ITEMS, STUDENT CORE ITEMS, INSTRUCTOR SELECTED ITEMS, OR COMPLETE FORM ITEMS S PRESENTED NEXT. THE RESULTS ARE TO BE INTERPRETED IN E SAME WAY. HOWEVER, NORMATIVE DATA MAY NOT BE AVAILABLE

INSTRUCTOR REPORT

FOR: B. LAUMANN DEPT SPED COURSE 465 SECTION A46 DEPT CODE 20350 SEMESTER: SPNG YEAR: 2000

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA IN PERCENTS BASED ON 18 COMPLETED FORMS

1. CLASS STATUS

FRESH	SOPH	JUNIOR	SENIOR	GRAD	OTHER	OMIT
0	0	0	0	94	0	6

2. PRE-COURSE OPINION TOWARD:

	POS	NO OP	NEG	OMIT
INSTRUCTOR	89	6	0	6
COURSE	67	22	6	6

3. THIS COURSE WAS DESIGNATED REQUIRED

SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED	REQUIRED BUT A CHOICE	ELECTIVE	OMIT
61	6	28	6

4. COURSE IN

MAJOR	MINOR	OTHER	OMIT
78	0	17	6

5. SEX: MALE 11 FEMALE 72 OMIT 17

6. EXPECTED GRADE: MEAN = 4.9

A	B	C	D	E	OMIT
83	11	0	0	0	6

INSTRUCTOR DESIGNATED CLASS TYPE: TEAM TAUGHT

OPTIONAL ITEMS--CATEGORIES

	1	2	3	4	5	OMIT
ITEM A	0	0	0	0	0	100
ITEM B	0	0	0	0	0	100

GLOBAL CORE ITEM RESULTS

PERCENTS WITH FREQUENCIES BENEATH

ITEM	EXCEPTIONALLY HIGH-5	4	3	2	EXCEPTIONALLY LOW-1	OMIT	SUMMARY STATISTICS MEAN	STD DEV
1. RATE THE INSTRUCTOR'S OVERALL TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS	67 (12)	33 (6)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4.7	0.5
2. RATE THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THIS COURSE	61 (11)	33 (6)	6 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4.6	0.6

COMPARISON OF MEAN RATING

ROW 1: HIGH REQ/ FACULTY
ROW 2: SPECIAL ED.

	LOW	LOW AVG	AVG	HI AVG	HI
1				OOXOO	
2			OOOXOOOO		
1				OOXOO	
2			OOXOOO		

INTERPRETATION GUIDE FOR COMPARISON OF MEANS

THE CLASS MEAN RATING IS COMPARED WITH ONE OR TWO GROUPS. GROUP 1 (ROW 1 FOR EACH ITEM) IS CAMPUS-WIDE BASED ON REQUIRED/ELECTIVE NATURE OF COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR RANK. GROUP 2 (ROW 2) IS DEPARTMENT-WIDE. THE CLASS MEAN (THE 'X') IS DENOTED UNDER ONE OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE NORM CATEGORIES:

HI - HIGHEST 10%
HI AVG - NEXT 20%
AVG - MIDDLE 40%
)W AVG - NEXT 20%
.OW - LOWEST 10%

EACH ROW CONTAINING AN X AND SEVERAL O'S SHOWS THE CLASS AVERAGE RATING IN COMPARISON TO GROUPS 1 AND 2. X INDICATES THE RELATIVE PLACEMENT OF THE MEAN. O'S INDICATE THE RANGE OF UNCERTAINTY. THE RATINGS SHOULD BE READ, FOR EXAMPLE, AS LOW-AVERAGE TO AVERAGE OR HIGH-AVERAGE TO HIGH TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE RANGE OF UNCERTAINTY.

STUDENT RESPONSES TO DEPARTMENTAL CORE ITEMS, STUDENT CORE ITEMS, INSTRUCTOR SELECTED ITEMS, OR COMPLETE FORM ITEMS E PRESENTED NEXT. THE RESULTS ARE TO BE INTERPRETED IN E SAME WAY. HOWEVER, NORMATIVE DATA MAY NOT BE AVAILABLE

SpEd 465 Class Feedback
3/25/00

1. **What has been helpful?**
   - -Input from total class on WebBoard
   - -Videos & articles
   - -Accessibility to professors (e-mail, WebBoard, phone)
   - -Optional review session in Feb.
   - -Group discussions, personal experiences, case studies
   - -groups assigned for peer support & collaboration
   - -reading about topics I wouldn't choose on my own
   - -Article feedback
   - -NICU visit

2. **What needs more work?**
   - -Copies of readings/reading packet quality
   - -Rdgs. & Questions assigned at 1st class
   - -Talk more about attachment
   - -More time with group members and poster partners
   - -One more time getting comfortable with technology
   - -Go over strategies for intervention
   - WebBoard chat function is slow
   - Medical terms overwhelming
   - Group assignments somewhat confusing over Web

3. **Positive aspects of the course via distance:**
   -Fewer trips to campus
   -Go to WebBoard and see wealth of ideas from other students
   -Working on questions and responses with team keeps me on top of readings and better understanding of material
   -Flexible schedule to do assignments
   -Fits with work schedule
   -Hearing perspectives from people from a wide variety of backgrounds/levels of experience
   -New Internet skills
   -Comfort with Internet communication
   -Learned about resources on Web
   -Individual response from instructors

4. **Negative aspects of taking the course via distance:**
   -Miss personal interactions with classmates; only share ideas in small group
   -Miss face-to-face interactions (maybe schedule a weekly " Open chat")
   -Hard to work on a poster long distance with a partner
   -Miss feedback and group discussion due to less class time
   -Can't explore areas of interest due to tight schedule
   -Easy to misunderstand what is written or "not read" part of what is written and not know it
   -Difficult to schedule chat sessions
   -Pressure to keep up or read what is posted (almost daily)
   -Worrying that I missed or made a mistake in reading or sending something
   -Having to respond in a formal way to so many readings
   -Feeling somewhat out of touch with instructors
   -Lack of class discussion of new materials
   -Felt "isolated"

5. Other:

-Wanted opportunity to visit both NICU's
-More time spent at NICU
-Overall there are good and bad points about taking the class via distance
-Not being able to open portions of the Web page
-Felt hesitant and anxious about posting my thoughts- much different than talking
-Did not offer face to face learning/discussion

Appendix C

CASEI Student Demographics

Examples of CASEI Internship Forms (IFEP, Time Log, Evaluation forms)

On- Campus Internship Syllabus (SpEd 424I: Parent/Infant Play Group)

CASEI Student Demographics

Student	Gender/ Race	Location	Rural Population Served?	Highest Degree	Employer	Role	Total Yrs. in Early Intervetion
*D.H.	Female/ Caucasian	Springfield	Yes	M.Ed./ ECSE	S.I.U. School of Medicine	Diagnostic Coordinator	7 + yrs.
J.M.	Female/ Caucasian	Peoria	Yes	M.Ed./ ECSE	U. of I. Regional Diagnostic Center	Diagnostic Specialist in Pediatrics	16 + yrs.
J.O.	Female/ Caucasian	Decatur	Yes	M.Ed./ ECSE	Decatur School District	Coordinator of Infant/ Toddler Prevnetion Initiative Program	6 yrs.
** D.P.	Female/ Caucasian	Rock Island	Yes	B.S./ Sp.Ed.	Rock Island School District	E.C.S.E. Teacher	5 yrs. in E.C.S.E.
M.C.R.	Female/ Caucasian	Peoria	Yes	M.Ed./ ECSE	Easter Seals	EI Program Supervisor	10 yrs.
U.R.	Female/ African-American	East St. Louis	No	M.Ed./ ECSE	Hazel Bland Promise Center	Nurse	23 yrs.
E.R.	Female/ Caucasian	Blooming ton	Yes	M.Ed./ ECSE	Easter Seals	Child Dev. Specialist	4 yrs.
*K.S.	Female/ Caucasian	Monticello	Yes	M.Ed./ ECSE	Former Employee of Piatt Co. Mental Health Center	Former Child Dev. Specialist	8 yrs.

CASEI Student Demographics

Student	Gender/ Race	Location	Rural Population Served?	Highest Degree	Agency	Current Role	Total Yrs. in Early Intervention
A.A.	Female/ Caucasian	Champ./ Urbana	Yes	B.S./Early Childhood Education	U of I. QIC-D	Trainer & Technical Assistant	12 yrs.
J.B.	Female/ Caucasian	Springfield	Yes	B.S./Home Economics	Child & Family Connection	Child Dev. Specialist	7 yrs.
L.C.	Female/ Caucasian	Springfield	Yes	M.Ed./ ECSE	Springfield Public Schools	Evenstart Coordinator	6 yrs.
** T.C.	Male/ Caucasian	Mattoon	Yes	M.S./ El. Ed.	EIASE	Project Coordinator	7 yrs.
S.D.	Female/ Caucasian	Peoria	Yes	M.Ed./ ECSE	CSS	Child Dev. Specialist	23 yrs.
E.F.	Female/ Caucasian	Wood-stock	Yes	M.Ed./ ECSE	SEDOM & Pioneer Center	Occupational Therapist	12 yrs.
*P.F.	Female/ Caucasian	Springfield	Yes	M.Ed./ ECSE	Lincoln-Land Comm. College Day Care	Child Care Director	7 yrs.
**S.G.	Female/ Caucasian	Springfield	Yes	B.S./Child Family, & Comm. Services	SPARC	Child Dev. Specialist	8 mo.
G.C.	Male/ Caucasian	Clinton	Yes	M.S.W.	Tri-County Sp.Ed. Coop.	Social Worker	3 + yrs.

CASEI Student Demographics

Student	Gender/ Race	Location	Rural Population Served?	Highest Degree	Employer	Role	Total Yrs. in Early Intervetion
M.R.	Female/ Colombian	Chicago	No	B.S.	Advocate IMMC- Pediatric Dev. Center	Early Intervention Specialist	2 yrs.
D.V.	Female/ Caucasian	Malden	Yes	M.Ed./ ECSE & M.S.	Malden School District	Speech Therapist	4+ yrs.
V.K.	Female/ Caucasian	Malden	Yes	M.Ed./ ECSE	Malden School District	Early Childhood Teacher	5+ yrs.
J.G.	Female/ Caucasian	Danville	Yes	M.Ed./ ECSE	Danville School District	Hearing Impaired Consultant	5+ yrs.
A.L.	Female/ Caucasian	LaSalle	Yes	M.Ed./ ECSE	LaSalle School District	ECSE Teacher	6+ yrs.
J.T.	Female/ Caucasian	Champ./ Urbana	Yes	B.S./ Child Dev.	U of I QIC-D	Trainer & Technical Assistant	5+ yrs.

Note: * P.F., D.H., and K.S. have all graduated with an M.Ed. (Master of Education) in 1997. They were admitted under the previous OSEP grant.

** D.P. and S.G. were both admitted to CASEI but left the program for personal reasons.

** T.C. was admitted to CASEI, but left the program in 1998 to pursue doctoral studies at another university.

ACRONYMS:

SEDOM: Special Education District of McHenry County

SPARC: Springfield Association for Retarded Citizens

EIASE: Eastern IL Area of Special Education

IMMC: Illinois Masonic Medical Center

CSS: Catholic Social Services

QIC-D: Great Lakes Quality Improvement Center for Young Children with Disabilities. This is a federally funded grant project that provides training and technical assistance to Head Start and Early Head Start Programs in the midwest region.

ECSE: Early Childhood Special Education

S.I.U.: Southern Illinois University

U. of I.: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

CASEI Project
University of Illinois
INDIVIDUAL FIELD EXPERIENCE PLAN

Name: _____ Semester: _____

Address: _____ Course: _____

_____ Site: _____

Phone: (H)_____(O)_____ Address: _____

Program Competency Area	Competency-Based Tasks	Time-Line		Evaluation	Outcome Rating*
		Begin	End		

Name: _____ Semester: _____

Program Competency Area	Competency-Based Tasks	Time-Line		Evaluation	Outcome Rating*
		Begin	End		

Persons Agreeing to Plan:

Student: _____

University Supervisor: _____

Site Administrator: _____

Date: _____

End of Semester Review of Plan:

Student: _____

University Supervisor: _____

Site Administrator: _____

Date: _____

*Outcome Rating:

1 - Not completed at planned level of expectation.
2 - Needs considerable assistance in skill/task but is making progress.
3 - Needs occasional assistance to perform skill/task.
4 - Completed at planned level of expectation. Student performs skill/task effectively & independently.
5 - Completed beyond level of expectation. Student may apply the task/skill in novel & diverse ways.

Adapted from:
-Individual Field Experience Plan, University of Kentucky
-Practicum Handbook, University of Illinois
-Bruder et al., 1991, TECSE, 14(2)

CASEI Project
Internship Log

Name: _____ Work Site: _____

Semester: _____

Brief Description of Activity (related to individual field plan or internship)	Location of Activity (e.g., work, home)	Was Time Spent Outside of Work Hours? yes/no	Amount of Time Spent in Activity

CASEI Project
Intern Evaluation of Internship Process and Procedures

Your Name: _____Semester/Year: _____

University Supervisor: _____Site: _____

Now that you have completed a semester of CASEI internship, we would appreciate your giving us feedback on the internship process and procedures.

A. How comfortable did you feel with the following parts of the internship process?

	Not Comfortable				Very Comfortable
*Communicating with your university supervisor	1	2	3	4	5
*Understanding what was expected of you in this internship	1	2	3	4	5
*Understanding the competency-based nature of the internship (i.e., your goals are derived from a set of competencies for early intervention professionals)	1	2	3	4	5
*Clarifying your goals for this semester	1	2	3	4	5
*Developing the individualized field experience plan	1	2	3	4	5
*Organizing your time & integrating your internship activities with your work responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
*Completing the activities as delineated on your individualized field experience plan	1	2	3	4	5

B. Are there any specific suggestions that you can make with regard to improving the internship process in any of the above areas?

C. What have been the most useful aspects of this internship for you?

D. What have been the least useful or problemmatic aspects of this internship?

E. Please suggest any procedural changes that might improve the internship process for future CASEI students

F. What changes (if any) have you made in your practice as a result of this internship training?

G. Additional Comments (if any):

CASEI Project
Evaluation of University Supervisor
(end of internship experience)

Your Name: _____Semester/Year: _____

University Supervisor: _____

Site: _____

Please rate your university supervisor on each of the following professional behaviors. A rating of 1 indicates this behavior was not demonstrated while a 5 indicates that it was demonstrated to a high degree. A rating of 3 is average. You may use any rating between 1 and 5. List "NA" if there was no opportunity for this behavior to be exhibited. There is additional space if you choose to write comments.

	Rating	Comments
1. Completed tasks and responsibilities in a timely fashion.		
2. Fostered in the intern an attitude of inquiry, independent thinking, and respect for alternative approaches.		
3. Tailored supervision style to intern's level of independence in self-reflection while at the same time tried to increase intern's level of self-reflection.		
4. Facilitated the intern's development of an independent field experience plan.		
5. Focused feedback on intern's strengths and gave suggestions for intern's growth and learning.		
6. Provided the intern with resources or sources of information (as needed).		
7. Was available for discussion and assistance.		

	Rating	Comments
8. Used appropriate and objective procedures for evaluating performance and outcomes as specified in the individualized field experience plan.		
9. Modelled interdisciplinary collaboration in professional interactions with the internship site.		

In the interest of self-growth and learning, it is very helpful for an individual to receive specific feedback. Please take a few minutes to respond to the following questions about your university supervisor:

1. Please comment about any supervisory skills that you think were problemmatic for this individual.

2. Please describe the strengths you think this individual brought to the supervisory process.

CASEI Project: SELF-EVALUATION GUIDE
(End of Internship)

Student: _____ Date: _____

1. The most positive aspect of my internship experience this semester has been:

2. Two important things I have learned this semester have been:

3. Areas where I still feel challenged are:

4. As a result of this internship I have set the following two goals for myself to continue to work on in the future:

Adapted from K. McCartan

SpEd 424I
Stay N' Play Playgroup
Spring, 2001

Instructors:	Bernie Laumann	Jill Tompkins
Office:	288 Education	196 Children's Research Center
Telephone:	217/333-0260	217/333-3876
E-mail:	blaumann@uiuc.edu	jst@uiuc.edu
Office Hours:	By Appointment	By Appointment

Class Time and Location:
All playgroups will be held at Col. Wolfe School, 403 E. Healey Street, Champaign, IL 61820. We will have a cell phone no. (217) 621-9966 which your family can use to contact you at Col. Wolfe in case of an emergency.

We will meet at Col. Wolfe on the following Saturdays from 8:30 A.M. to 4:30 P.M.: Jan. 20, Feb. 10, Feb. 17, Feb. 24, and March 3. A snow date is scheduled for March 24. **You are expected to arrive on time and stay until class ends for the day.**

Class Attendance and Participation:
Attendance at the orientation meeting and at each playgroup is required. **If you are not attending due to illness or catastrophe, please call one of us prior to the session.**

Confidentiality:
All professionals working with young children and their families must adhere to certain ethical standards. As a student learning about professional behavior you are required to maintain confidentiality regarding the information that families share with you about themselves and their child. The law requires you to do this. Please refrain from discussing this personal information with others.

If you need any special accommodations please see the course instructors.*

Required Readings:

1. All students will be required to read several articles pertaining to the playgroup model and home visits. A readings packet for the course is available at: Notes N' Quotes 502 E. John St. Champaign. The phone number is 217/344-4433. Some readings will be distributed at the Playgroup Orientation.

2. All students will become familiar with various curriculum guides and activity books available for planning playgroup activities. These resources will be available for check out from the playgroup instructors.

3. In addition, some individual readings may be assigned based on specific family or child needs.

Rationale and Purpose of the Course: The playgroup experience is referred to as a practicum to convey that this is a period of practice and learning for each student. The purpose of this practicum experience is to provide students an opportunity to interact with infants/toddlers and their families. During the playgroup students receive individualized and team focused clinical supervision. Through this practicum students develop skills and knowledge in relation to parent/child interaction strategies, family/professional partnerships, teaming with students from different disciplines, and the importance of environmental arrangement.

Course Objectives:
As active participants in the playgroup experience students will:

1. Develop an understanding of the logistics of planning, implementing, and evaluating a playgroup, taking into account the specific issues related to the community and the setting.

2. Develop an understanding of thematic development and environmental arrangement when planning playgroups.

3. Develop an understanding of teaming with other professionals, providing support and feedback using effective communication skills.

4. Develop an understanding of dyadic and triadic strategies.

5. Develop skills and understanding in working with families using a family-centered philosophy.

6. Develop the ability to plan appropriate, individualized activities for children with and without disabilities.

7. Develop sensitivity to the issues related to an inclusive playgroup for children and families.

8. Develop greater understanding of young children and families from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Course Assignments:

Students are expected to plan, implement, and evaluate four 90 minute playgroup sessions for infants/toddlers and their parents. All playgroups will be supervised by one of the course instructors.

1. Each student will develop a Portfolio/Notebook containing records of their experiences in the practicum. This portfolio will be started at the playgroup orientation meetings and will be expanded throughout the semester. Notes from team planning meetings, handouts, parent contact records, articles, and feedback from evaluation sessions and supervisors are to be organized in the portfolio/notebook. **Portfolios will be checked by the instructors at the last class meeting on March 3rd.**

2. A journal will be kept which will provide the student the opportunity to reflect on the playgroup experiences. Reflections can also include the student's reactions to readings, the teaming process, and other aspects of the practicum experience. **The practicum journal will be shared with the instructors on the following dates: Feb. 17th and March 3rd. A final summary paper (3-5 pages in length) reflecting on the entire playgroup experience (including readings) will be due on Friday, March 9th.**

Grading:

The course grade is based on an S (satisfactory) or U (unsatisfactory). It is assumed that all written work will be of a professional quality that ensures clarity, content, spelling, and grammar are correct. All references will be written using APA guidelines. All assignments will be turned in on the due date unless the student has made prior arrangements with the instructors.

Course Readings:

Reading	Due Date
1. Appl, D.J., Fahl-Gooler, F. & McCollum, J.A.(1997). Inclusive parent-child playgroups: How comfortable are parents of children with disabilities in the groups? *Infant-Toddler Intervention*, 7(4), 235-249. 2. McCollum, J.A., & Yates, T.J.(1994). Dyad as focus, triad as means: A family-centered approach to supporting parent-child interactions. *Infants and Young Children*, 6(4), 54-63.	**Orientation to Playgroup** **Jan. 20th**
3. Zeavin, C. (1997). Toddlers at play: Environments at work. *Young Children*, 52(3), 72-77. 4. Caruso, D.A. (1998). Play and learning in infancy: Research and implications. *Young Children*, 43(6), 63-70. 5. Buchanan, M. & Cooney, M. (2000). Play at home, play in the classroom. *Young Exceptional Children*, 3(4), 9-15.	**Environmental Arrangement** **Feb. 10th**
6. Olson, J. & Murphy, C.L. (1999). Self-assessment: A key process of successful team development. *Young Exceptional Children*, 2(3), 2-8. 7. Tuchman, L.I. (1996). The team and models of teaming. In P.Rosin, A.D Whitehead, L.I. Tuchman, G.S. Jesien, A.L Begun, and L.Irwin (Eds.), *Partnerships in family-centered care: A guide to collaborative early intervention* (pp. 119-143). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes	**Teaming** **Feb. 17th**
8. Ohtake,Y., Santos, R.M., & Fowler, S.A (2000). It's a three-way conversation: Families, service providers, and interpreters working together. *Young Exceptional Children*, 4(1), 12-18. 9. Lynch, E.W. (1998). Developing cross-cultural competence. In Lynch, E.W. & Hanson, M.J (Eds.), *Developing cross-cultural competence: A guide for working with children and their families* (pp. 47- 86). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.	**Diversity Issues** **Feb. 24th**
10. Lally, J.R. (1995). The impact of child care policies on infant/toddler identity formation. *Young Children*, 51(1), 58-67.	**Playgroup Wrap-Up** **March 3rd**

Appendix D

CASEI Student Survey, Competency Rating Scale, and Cover Letter

CASEI Employer Competency Rating Scale and Cover Letter

INSIDE ADDRESS

June 1, 2001

Dear (INSERT CASEI STUDENT's NAME),

As you may or may not know the CASEI Project has ended and we are writing a final report for our funder, the Office of Special Education Programs in Washington, D.C. We want to take this opportunity to gather evaluative data from you concerning the CASEI Program. We would like to know your evaluation of the program and how it has impacted your work as a professional in the field of early intervention/early childhood special education. Your responses will be confidential and will be aggregated across students when presented in the final report.

We have tried to keep the survey as brief as possible. We need your input at this time to assist us in evaluating the goals and objectives of the project. We also hope we can use this information in the future should we apply for other federal training funds similar to CASEI.

Please use the enclosed envelope (a graduate student will summarize the data for us) to return the survey by **June 22, 2001**. We appreciate your willingness to help us evaluate the CASEI Program. If you complete the enclosed postcard and mail it to us, we will mail you a free copy of the *Young Exceptional Children Monograph #2 Natural Environments and Inclusion* as a token of our appreciation for completing this survey. Thanks in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Micki Ostrosky, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator

Bernie Laumann
Project Coordinator

Survey of CASEI Program Participants
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
June, 2001

---

1. How would you describe your current status? Please read over the entire list and check ALL which apply to your situation.

___ full time work
___ part time work
___ early interventionist
___ teacher
___ administrator/supervisor
___ other
___ support staff member (O.T., nurse, speech therapist, etc.)
___ unemployed

2. What is your present title or position? _____

3. How many years have you been in this position? _____

4. If graduated, how many years did it take you to receive your M.Ed. Degree? _____

5. If employed, check ALL of the settings and age groups with which you work.

___ school setting
___ birth-three yrs.
___ agency
___ three-five yrs.
___ hospital/medical setting
___ five yrs. and older
___ other (please specify:)

6. Please check ALL of the populations that you serve.

___ rural ___town/small city ___ urban
___ suburban ___ other (specify:)

7. Please check ALL of the cultures/ethnicities of the families you work with:

___ African-American
___ Hispanic
___ European-American
___ Asian-American
___ American Indian
___ Other (please list)

8. If applicable, check the exceptionalities of the children you work with.

___ physical disability
___ visual impairment
___ developmental delay
___ hearing impairment
___ speech/language impairment
___ autism/PDD/Aspberger's Syndrome
___ traumatic brain injury
___ other health impaired
___ other (please list: _____)

9. On the scale below, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the CASEI Program by circling the appropriate item with 5 being high satisfaction and 1 being low.

	High				Low	N/A
Overall quality of academic instruction	5	4	3	2	1	0
Overall quality of academic guidance	5	4	3	2	1	0

(OVER)

Quality of on-campus internship (Saturday Playgroup)	5	4	3	2	1	0
Quality of on-site internship (internship at your work site)	5	4	3	2	1	0
Overall satisfaction with CASEI program	5	4	3	2	1	0

10. Now, please indicate your level of satisfaction with your current professional position.

High				Low	N/A
5	4	3	2	1	0

11. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions. If you need more space, you may add another sheet of paper.

a.) List THREE things which you consider most important to include in an Administrative/ Consultative Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) master's program.

b.) What were the strengths of the CASEI Program for you (people, courses, networking, resources, experience, etc.)?

c.)What were weaknesses of the CASEI Program (people, courses, networking, resources, experience, etc.)? Please list any suggestions for changes in the CASEI Program (i.e. things you feel should be included in a future grant and things that should not be included).

d.) What competencies do you feel you have acquired as a result of being a student in the master's program in ECSE at UIUC?

e.) Which particular competencies do you use most often in your current position?

f.) What competencies were not addressed in the CASEI Program that you think should have been covered?

g.) How well did the CASEI Program prepare you for an administrative/consultative role in early intervention?

h.) Please see the enclosed CASEI Program philosophy statements. How well did coursework match these philosophy statements?

i.). How well did your internship experiences (both on-campus and at your work site) match the philosophy statements?

j.) Other comments or concerns that you would like to share regarding your experiences in the CASEI Program.

k.) Please complete the enclosed Competency Rating Scale. Mail the completed Competency Rating Scale form and this questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope by June 22, 2001.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire! Your responses will assist us in completing our final report and also in better serving students in the future. We applaud your commitment to young children and their families.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Early Childhood Special Education
Program Philosophy Statements
March 1998 Revision

Philosophy Related to Families

The ECSE training program is based on the beliefs that families know their child best and families make a unique contribution to the family-professional partnership. Professionals work with families to access support, mobilize resources, and identify their existing strengths, concerns, and priorities toward meeting the developmental needs of the whole child. Through this collaborative process, the competence and confidence of both families and professionals are enhanced.

Philosophy Related to Children

The ECSE training program views children as active participants in their own learning. Play environments that support mutually pleasurable child-child and adult-child interactions are based on developmentally, culturally, and individually appropriate principles. Individual objectives are embedded within play and daily routines and are facilitated by observant, responsive adults.

Philosophy Related to Teaming

Children, families, and professionals benefit from the knowledge and expertise that each team member shares. Intervention is characterized by a spirit of collaboration in which team members operate interchangeably in the intervention process, to the extent possible, while continuing to function as resources to one another in relation to their own disciplinary expertise.

Philosophy Related to Student Learning and Supervision

Students preparing for careers in early childhood special education will integrate coursework, practica experiences, personal skills, and resources to become competent professionals. To support student growth, the ECSE training program uses a clinical model of supervision designed to foster reflective practice and the students' ability and motivation to direct their own continued professional development.

Philosophy Related to Administration and Consultation

Administrators of early intervention programs for young children consult and communicate with families, staff, and other professionals in an authentic, positive, and caring manner. Their leadership style is characterized by the ability to assist staff and families to make connections that build trust, a sense of community, and the commitment to carry out shared philosophies and goals for young children with special needs.

The early intervention program administrator sets the example for engaging others in the development of a culturally sensitive, family-centered collaborative program environment. The administrator demonstrates strong organizational skills and secures resources for carrying out the mission of the program so that early intervention team members are able to effectively design exemplary services for families and children as well as develop their skills and knowledge in the field of early childhood education.

INSIDE ADDRESS

June 1, 2001

Dear .

We are requesting your help in completing a survey on one of your supervisees. An employee, **(INSERT EMPLOYEE's NAME)**, of your agency/school district has been a graduate student in the Early Childhood Special Education Master's Program at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. A federal grant, the *Consultation and Administration Specialists for Early Intervention (CASEI) Project*, provided tuition waivers, stipends, and other financial support for **(INSERT EMPLOYEE's NAME)** to enable her to engage in graduate studies through weekend, evening, and Internet-based coursework while maintaining employment in the field of early intervention/early childhood special education.

The *CASEI Project* recently ended and we are gathering evaluation data to include in our final report to our funders, the Office of Special Education Programs in Washington, D.C. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed Competency Rating Scale and return it to us in the self-addressed, stamped envelope by **June 22, 2001**. Your responses will be confidential and will be aggregated across students when presented in the final report. Please call Bernie Laumann (217/333-4123) or e-mail her: blaumann@uiuc.edu, if you have any questions regarding this scale.

We appreciate your willingness to assist us in gathering evaluative data on the CASEI Project participants.

Sincerely,

Micki Ostrosky, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator

Bernie Laumann
Project Coordinator

CASEI Project: Knowledge and Performance Competencies

1.0 Foundation Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge related to early intervention: Development and Intervention

1.1.1 Demonstrate knowledge of sequences and processes of normal development and their implications for intervention, including specific knowledge in the following domains:

Cognition, including phases of sensorimotor intelligence;
Language/communication;
Social/emotional development, including attachment and interaction;
Physical/motor;
Adaptive behavior.

1.1.2 Demonstrate knowledge of effects of specific disabilities and deviations on development.

1.1.3 Demonstrate knowledge of biological and environmental risk factors affecting development.

1.1.4 Understand health, safety, and nutrition variables affecting development.

1.1.5 Become familiar with etiologies, characteristics, and prognoses for various disabilities.

1.1.6 Become familiar with typical treatment approaches for common disabilities and conditions, including educational, therapeutic and medical approaches.

1.2 Knowledge related to families: Development and Intervention

1.2.1 Demonstrate knowledge of historical and current theories of family structure, life cycle, and cultural views of the family.

1.2.2 Develop understanding of cultural variations in families and the resulting programmatic implications.

1.2.3 Become familiar with models of stress, support, and coping as they relate to families of infants and young children with special needs.

1.2.4 Become familiar with the influence of infants/children at-risk or with special needs on families.

1.2.5 Become familiar with models consistent with the philosophy of family-centered intervention.

1.3 Knowledge of teamwork and interpersonal dynamics supporting early intervention.

1.3.1 Identify characteristics of adult learners.

1.3.2 Become familiar with strategies for effective interpersonal communication.

1.3.3 Demonstrate understanding of roles of team members including sharing, consultation, collaboration, joint goal setting, and planning as well as knowledge of group dynamics as thy relate to delivery of early intervention services.

1.3.4 Demonstrate knowledge of models of service coordination and of the role of service coordination in early intervention.

1.4 Knowledge related to foundations of early intervention

1.4.1 Become familiar with moral and legal issues affecting delivery of services (e.g., genetics, bioethics).

1.4.2 Become familiar with federal, state, and local rules and regulations governing infant, toddler, and preschool programs.

1.4.3 Become familiar with the role of funding and administrative structures in infant, toddler, and preschool programs.

1.4.4 Become familiar with the range of state and local agencies typically providing services to young children and their families.

1.4.5 Demonstrate knowledge of the history and rationale of early childhood special education, including various theoretical foundations.

1.4.6 Demonstrate knowledge of current issues and research in early childhood special education.

1.4.7 Demonstrate knowledge of principles and practices in evaluation of early intervention programs.

1.4.8 Demonstrate knowledge of sources of research related to early intervention of major research methods and procedures, and of approaches to accessing and organizing research knowledge.

1.4.9 Demonstrate knowledge of the theories and practices associated with integration/inclusion of children with special needs including knowledge and scope and sequence of preschool curricula in early childhood and early childhood special education.

2.0 Delivering services to infants, toddlers, and preschoolers

2.1 Assessment

2.1.1 Evaluate reliability, validity, appropriateness, and cultural relevancy of measurement instruments and procedures for specific assessment and intervention purposes.

2.1.2 Design measurement plan for gathering information, including specifying what, who, when, where, and how information will be used.

2.1.3 Administer, score, and interpret norm-referenced tests across developmental domains.

2.1.4 Administer, score, and interpret criterion referenced tests across developmental domains.

2.1.5 Administer, score, and interpret assessments of temperment and learning style.

2.1.6 Administer, score, and interpret assessments measuring attachmen and adult-child interaction.

2.1.7 Administer, score, and interpret assessments of the home and othe caretaking environments for potential to facilitate child learning.

2.1.8 Develop an interview protocol for obtaining information from the family on :
a. developmental status b. temperament c. daily activities

2.1.9 Develop, implement, and interpret behavior observation and data collection systems appropriate both to structured and natural play settings and that may be used to assess for maintenance of newly acquired skills and behaviors over time and across settings.

2.1.10 Write well-organized, factual, and useful assessment reports, which demonstrate appropriateness for families and team members.

2.1.11 Synthesize and interpret measurement information obtained from other professionals.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2.1.12 Develop a sequential analysis of child's functional levels, strengths, and needs in developmental and behavioral areas, based on assessment results.

2.1.13 Share assessment results with other staff and with family for purposes of making decisions related to developing a comprehensive intervention plan.

2.2 Intervention

2.2.1 Develop individual intervention/instructional plan, based on outcomes of assessment and principles of learning and development, including adapting curriculum or instruction to individualize in inclusive settings.

2.2.2 Develop/modify individual instructional programs, intervention, or curricula to encourage new skills/behavior acquisition.

2.2.3 Develop behavior management systems and individual instructional programs to promote/support learning and development of adaptive behaviors and where needed to modify impeding behaviors.

2.2.4 Integrate individual objectives and programs into child-directed, teacher-directed activities across contexts including daily routines, play and planned activities.

2.2.5 Plan and construct specific learning environments which are appropriate to a child's developmental level and interests and which invite independent child and/or child/parent play.

2.2.6 Find and incorporate available curriculum guides and other resource materials as appropriate for meeting individual and group objectives.

2.2.7 Use interaction strategies conducive to developing play, exploration, independence, and problem solving.

2.2.8 Use intervention strategies responsive to a particular child's interaction and learning style.

2.2.9 Analyze and develop a plan for modifying non-productive adult-child interaction.

2.2.10 Plan, schedule, and implement activities based on knowledge of child development and/or individual child needs, particularly those of children with disabilties.

2.2.11 Use individual and group management techniques which maintain child participation and interest in learning activities which facilitate child success.

2.2.12 Integrate strategies recommended by other disciplines into intervention activities.

2.2.13 Incorporate special handling techniques, and adaptive equipment into intervention activities.

2.2.14 Attend to and respond at a level appropriate to child communication attempts.

2.2.15 Use communication strategies which elicit and support child communication.

2.2.16 Use intervention strategies which support and facilitate parent interactions with their children.

2.3 Evaluation

2.3.1 Develop, plan, and coordinate classroom activities for systematic data collection on individual and/or group objectives.

2.3.2 Spontaneously modify planned activities as necessary based on child performance.

2.3.3 Collect child performance data during planned and unplanned activities.

2.3.4 Modify individual and group plans based on performance data.

2.3.5 Use data to summarize child and family progress and update goals and objectives.

3.0 Delivering services to families

3.1 Assessment

3.1.1 Involve family members in assessing child's development and intervention needs.

3.1.2 Establish partnership with family in discussing results and implications of child's assessment.

3.1.3 Assess family preferences and goals for service delivery.

3.1.4 Assess family strengths with regard to implementing child's intervention plan.

3.1.5 Assess family resource needs and training needs with regard to implementing the child's intervention plan.

3.2 Intervention

3.2.1 Collaboratively develop a systematic individual family service plan addressing all components required by IDEA (Re-authorized 1997).

3.2.2 Collaboratively with family member(s), plan participation in activities related to child and/or family needs.

3.2.3 Provide family members when requested with information on identified topics of need.

3.2.4 Review and interpret to parents information from other disciplines.

3.2.5 Use language that is clearly understood by family members.

3.2.6 Use active listening and other supportive communication techniques with family members.

3.2.7 Plan and implement individual sessions for meeting knowledge and skill needs of parents.

3.2.8 Plan and implement group sessions for meeting knowledge and skill needs of parents.

3.2.9 Develop home activities for child which reflect needs of child and family, family preferences, and parent-infant interaction style, and which are appropriate to the home environment.

3.3 Advocacy/support

3.3.1 Act as advocate for child and family in obtaining services from other professionals/agencies/programs.

3.3.2 Act as advocate for family in obtaining funding to meet specific needs.

3.3.3 Obtain and/or refer families to parenting resources, including publications, parent groups, organizations.

3.3.4 Provide support to families in ways that meet individual needs; use planned group activities to meet family support needs.

3.3.5 Provide individual support to families.

3.3.6 Provide opportunities for linkages among families.

3.4 Evaluation

3.4.1 Evaluate impact of program on individual families/family members in relation to individual goals.

3.4.2 Obtain from family members information to evaluate opportunities for family activities, participation in program.

4.0 Team participation and leadership

4.1 Demonstate knowledge of alternative models of team functioning associated with individuals represented on early childhood teams; roles of other disciplines, service providers and family members; and with potential for communication barriers among disciplines. These disciplines should include, but are not limited to: teachers, speech/language pathologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, psychologists.

4.2 Use appropriate team model to work collaboratively with other team members and direct service providers in every-day programming, in seeking out specialized knowledge, and as a resource.

4.3 Provide regular programmatic updates to relevant team members.

4.4 Effectively and systematically lead team in making decisions.

4.5 Establish and maintain rapport with all team members by using effective communication and problem-solving strategies, managing personal and team conflict and confrontation to facilitate the collaborative process and interpersonal relationships.

4.6 Develop formal and informal strategies for sharing disciplinary expertise with other team members.

4.7 Provide peer supervision for other team members.

4.8 Work with families to obtain and coordinate services from multidisciplinary team and/or providers including transition to new settings.

4.9 Coordinate with other agencies involved in service to a particular family.

4.10 Consult with receiving professionals when a child moves to a new placement as necessary.

5.0 Organizing service delivery systems

5.1 Design teaching/learning environments appropriate for promoting acquisition, maintenance, and generalization of goals across relevant environments.

5.2 Select/develop/adapt an array of materials/equipment for children at different stages of development and in different domains.

5.3 Outline an array of appropriate family service options which take into account differences in cultural values, child needs, and family capabilities and needs.

5.4 Specify organization of time, space, and adult roles for service delivery in different intervention settings.

5.5 Outline alternative team structures to support programmatic goals in different types of early intervention settings.

5.6 Plan/conduct public relations activities to gain awareness of and support for early intervention.

5.7 Develop a plan to evaluate outcomes in relation to overall service goals of program, including utilization of information derived from evaluation.

6.0 Professional characteristics

6.1 Demonstrate enthusiasm and enjoyment in working with children, parent, and other professionals.

6.2 Demonstrate professional work habits, including dependability, time management, independence, responsibility.

6.3 Demonstrate flexibility in response to inevitable variability in infant services.

6.4 Demonstrate logical and coherent oral and written communication skills.

6.5 Reflect concern for the dignity and worth of other persons.

6.6 Adhere to the professional ethics and standards of performance.

6.7 Adhere to the stated policies and procedures of the program.

6.8 Participate in professional organizations.

6.9 Seek and/or design experiences for own professional growth.

6.10 Keep informed of current professional literature.

6.11 Show poise in difficult situations.

6.12 Engage in self-evaluation/self-reflection of strengths and weaknesses to modify personal behaviors influencing the collaborative process.

7.0 Administration and Consultation

7.1 Demonstrate leadership skills by engaging the efforts of all staff members through encouragement, involvement, commitment to shared values, and personal example.

7.2 Design a staff performance evaluation in accordance with clinical supervision methods, program evaluation plans, and professional goal setting.

7.3 Facilitate staff members' performance and growth by providing opportunities for inservice support, development of inservice opportunities, and peer mentoring.

7.4 Design effective staff selection and hiring practices in accordance with personnel guidelines.

7.5 Collaboratively develop shared philosophy statements, program standards, and program goals with other staff members and families.

7.6 Demonstrate the ability to manage the early intervention program through day to day organizational support (i.e., planning agendas, record keeping, resource allocation, etc.).

7.7 Develop and write grant proposals that include plans for implementing data collection, designing program activities, and enhancing services for families.

7.8 Represent the program to other community agencies and facilitate linkages to other community agencies and programs.

7.9 Engage in effective consultation skills during meetings with families and other professionals to carry out program activities.

CASEI Project: Competency Rating Scale

The competency rating scale is a self-analysis procedure to be completed by the intern at the beginning of the internship and again at the end of the internship experience. The rating scale is keyed to the performance competencies .

Although not required, the intern may also wish to ask the university supervisor to complete independent ratings in order to have some substantiation of his/her own ratings. This rating scale is designed to give the intern a way to think about his/her own professional needs and development.

Directions: Evaluate your current level of competence in the content and skill areas relevant to early intervention. When you have completed the form identify areas you consider to be of highest priority for your learning this semester.

Name: _____

Date: _____Start of term _____End of term

		Low Competence		Average		High Competence
1.0	Foundation Knowledge					
1.1	Normal and atypical development					
1.1.1		1	2	3	4	5
1.1.2		1	2	3	4	5
1.1.3		1	2	3	4	5
1.1.4		1	2	3	4	5
1.1.5		1	2	3	4	5
1.1.6		1	2	3	4	5
1.2	Knowledge related to families:					
1.2.1		1	2	3	4	5
1.2.2		1	2	3	4	5
1.2.3		1	2	3	4	5
1.2.4		1	2	3	4	5
1.2.5		1	2	3	4	5

1.3 Knowledge of teamwork

1.3.1	1	2	3	4	5
1.3.2	1	2	3	4	5
	Low Competence		Average		High Competence
1.3.3	1	2	3	4	5
1.3.4	1	2	3	4	5

1.4 Foundations of early intervention

1.4.1	1	2	3	4	5
1.4.2	1	2	3	4	5
1.4.3	1	2	3	4	5
1.4.4	1	2	3	4	5
1.4.5	1	2	3	4	5
1.4.6	1	2	3	4	5
1.4.7	1	2	3	4	5
1.4.8	1	2	3	4	5
1.4.9	1	2	3	4	5

2.0 Delivering services to children

2.1 Assessment

2.1.1	1	2	3	4	5
2.1.2	1	2	3	4	5
2.1.3	1	2	3	4	5
2.1.4	1	2	3	4	5
2.1.5	1	2	3	4	5
2.1.6	1	2	3	4	5
2.1.7	1	2	3	4	5
2.1.8	1	2	3	4	5
2.1.9	1	2	3	4	5
2.1.10	1	2	3	4	5
2.1.11	1	2	3	4	5
2.1.12	1	2	3	4	5
2.1.13	1	2	3	4	5

2.2 Intervention

2.2.1	1	2	3	4	5
2.2.2	1	2	3	4	5
2.2.3	1	2	3	4	5

2.2.4	1	2	3	4	5
2.2.5	1	2	3	4	5
2.2.6	1	2	3	4	5
2.2.7	1	2	3	4	5
2.2.8	1	2	3	4	5
2.2.9	1	2	3	4	5
2.2.10	1	2	3	4	5
	Low Competence		Average		High Competence
2.2.11	1	2	3	4	5
2.2.12	1	2	3	4	5
2.2.13	1	2	3	4	5
2.2.14	1	2	3	4	5
2.2.15	1	2	3	4	5
2.2.16	1	2	3	4	5

2.3 Evaluation

2.3.1	1	2	3	4	5
2.3.2	1	2	3	4	5
2.3.3	1	2	3	4	5
2.3.4	1	2	3	4	5
2.3.5	1	2	3	4	5

3.0 Delivering services to families

3.1 Assessment

3.1.1	1	2	3	4	5
3.1.2	1	2	3	4	5
3.1.3	1	2	3	4	5
3.1.4	1	2	3	4	5
3.1.5	1	2	3	4	5

3.2 Intervention

3.2.1	1	2	3	4	5
3.2.2	1	2	3	4	5
3.2.3	1	2	3	4	5
3.2.4	1	2	3	4	5
3.2.5	1	2	3	4	5
3.2.6	1	2	3	4	5
3.2.7	1	2	3	4	5
3.2.8	1	2	3	4	5
3.2.9	1	2	3	4	5

3.3 Advocacy/support

	3.3.1	1	2	3	4	5
	3.3.2	1	2	3	4	5
	3.3.3	1	2	3	4	5
	3.3.4	1	2	3	4	5
	3.3.5	1	2	3	4	5
	3.3.6	1	2	3	4	5
		Low Competence		Average		High Competence
	3.4 Evaluation					
	3.4.1	1	2	3	4	5
	3.4.2	1	2	3	4	5
4.0	Team participation and leadership					
	4.1	1	2	3	4	5
	4.2	1	2	3	4	5
	4.3	1	2	3	4	5
	4.4	1	2	3	4	5
	4.5	1	2	3	4	5
	4.6	1	2	3	4	5
	4.7	1	2	3	4	5
	4.8	1	2	3	4	5
	4.9	1	2	3	4	5
	4.10	1	2	3	4	5
5.0	Organizing service delivery systems					
	5.1	1	2	3	4	5
	5.2	1	2	3	4	5
	5.3	1	2	3	4	5
	5.4	1	2	3	4	5
	5.5	1	2	3	4	5
	5.6	1	2	3	4	5
	5.7	1	2	3	4	5
6.0	Professional characteristics					
	6.1	1	2	3	4	5
	6.2	1	2	3	4	5
	6.3	1	2	3	4	5
	6.4	1	2	3	4	5
	6.5	1	2	3	4	5
	6.6	1	2	3	4	5
	6.7	1	2	3	4	5
	6.8	1	2	3	4	5
	6.9	1	2	3	4	5
	6.10	1	2	3	4	5

	6.11	1	2	3	4	5
	6.12	1	2	3	4	5
7.0	Administration and Supervision					
	7.1	1	2	3	4	5
	7.2	1	2	3	4	5
	7.3	1	2	3	4	5
	7.4	1	2	3	4	5
	7.5	1	2	3	4	5
	7.6	1	2	3	4	5
	7.7	1	2	3	4	5
	7.8	1	2	3	4	5

Competency rating scale: priorities and strengths

Name: _____

Date: _____Start of term _____End of term

Priority Learning Areas:

Priority Activities (specific tasks you would like to be involved in to gain knowledge and/or skill in your priority areas):

Areas That Are Relative Strengths:

Areas in Which You Have Gained Most Skills (end of term):

Appendix E

Summary of CASEI Student Survey Results

Summary of CASEI Student Competency Rating Scale Results

Summary of CASEI Employer Competency Rating Scale Results

Survey of CASEI Program Participants
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
June, 2001
CASEI Graduates (n=8)

---

1. How would you describe your current status? Please read over the entire list and check ALL which apply to your situation.

___ full time work (8)
___ part time work (1)
___ early interventionist (6)
___ teacher (4)
___ administrator/supervisor (2)
___ other (0)
___ support staff member (O.T., nurse, speech therapist, etc.) (3)
___ unemployed (0)

2. What is your present title or position?
   - Itinerant Teacher of the Hearing Impaired
   - OTR
   - E.I Program Director, Nurse Consultant
   - Prevention Initiative Coordinator
   - Special Education Teacher
   - Diagnostic Specialist in Developmental Disabilities in Pediatrics
   - Teacher of Blended At Risk & ECE Classroom
   - SLP
   - Child Development Consultant

3. How many years have you been in this position? (17, 10, 1, 5, 2, 15, 15, 8)
   Range= 1 to 17 yrs. Mean= 9.13 yrs.

4. If graduated, how many years did it take you to receive your M.Ed. Degree?
   (3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2.5, 3.5, 2.5) Range = 2.5 to 3.5 yrs. Mean= 2.94 yrs.

5. If employed, check ALL of the settings and age groups with which you work.

___ school setting (7)
___ birth-three yrs. (3)
___ agency (3)
___ three-five yrs. (6)
___ hospital/medical setting (0)
___ five yrs. and older (3)
___ other (please specify:

6. Please check ALL of the populations that you serve.

___ rural (4) ___town/small city (6) ___ urban (3)
___ suburban (2) ___ other (specify: none)

7. Please check ALL of the cultures/ethnicities of the families you work with:

___ African-American (6)
___ Hispanic (8)
___ European-American (7)
___ Asian-American (4)
___ American Indian (0)
___ Other (please list) (0)

8. If applicable, check the exceptionalities of the children you work with.

___ physical disability (6)
___ visual impairment (4)
___ developmental delay (8)

___ hearing impairment (5)
___ speech/language impairment (6)
___ autism/PDD/Aspbergers (6)
___ traumatic brain injury (2)
___ other health impaired (4)
___ other (0)

9. On the scale below, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the CASEI Program by circling the appropriate item with 5 being high satisfaction and 1 being low.

	High				Low	N/A
Overall quality of academic instruction	5	4	3	2	1	0
	(7)	(1)	(mean (ms) = 4.87)			
Overall quality of academic guidance	5	4	3	2	1	0
	(7)	(1)	(ms= 4.87)			
Quality of on-campus internship	5	4	3	2	1	0
(Saturday Playgroup)	(5)	(3)	(ms= 4.62)			
Quality of on-site internship	5	4	3	2	1	0
(internship at your work site)	(6)	(1)	(1)	(ms= 4.62)		
Overall satisfaction with CASEI program	5	4	3	2	1	0
	(8)	(ms= 5.00)				

10. Now, please indicate your level of satisfaction with your current professional position.

Ms=.3.75	High				Low	N/A
	5	4	3	2	1	0
	(4)	(1)	(2)			(1)

11. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions. If you need more space, you may add another sheet of paper.

a.) List THREE things which you consider most important to include in an Administrative/ Consultative Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) master's program.

- Team participation & leadership skills
- Skills to appropriately work with families
- Internships to give/provide hands on experiences
- Grant preparation
- Staff (hiring, training)
- Program evaluation and construction
- An administrative internship for a few weeks would have been beneficial
- Budgetary / Finances
- Theory & techniques of supervision
- Training for professionals dealing with families and their various backgrounds
- Professional respect towards other professionals and how to work together (teaming)
- Teaching how to observe ; child environment and situation
- Internship (choices)

- Families
- Leadership skills
- Teaming
- Understanding of IFSP & IEP process
- Understanding of atypical development
- Transition process between programs

b.) What were the strengths of the CASEI Program for you (people, courses, networking, resources, experience, etc.)?

- Saturday classes
- Flexibility in scheduling classes on Saturdays
- Networking
- Speakers
- Working with other professionals in classes
- The resources available and how to use them
- Enjoyed many of the course taught through the program. However the courses would not have been as useful if it were not for the experienced students in the program. Their hands on knowledge was very helpful.
- Teaching style- collaborative, varied presentation
- Well thought out curriculum
- Team teaching approach
- Resources-different disciplines in programs
- Experienced adult learners.
- Course scheduling and educational support. Networking and teaming are important as a career begins.
- Teachers and courses are a strength. They provided extremely useful information and it could be applied directly to my job. I also thought the experiences during the internships were good.

c.)What were weaknesses of the CASEI Program (people, courses, networking, resources, experience, etc.)? Please list any suggestions for changes in the CASEI Program (i.e. things you feel should be included in a future grant and things that should not be included).

- I was on the Saturday format for the on campus playgroup. I would have liked to meet for more sessions. I felt that I would have got to know the families better.
- Individuals considered for CASEI should come in with fundamental knowledge. Perhaps just a brief review on basics. Financial planning should be added and teaming with family interaction should be added.
- Distance of drive from my home
- For some classes it was very difficult to get the amount of work completed in the short time allowed due to time constraints.
- How to "sell' yourself to a program once the degree is achieved-either as an employee or as an independent consultant.

d.) What competencies do you feel you have acquired as a result of being a student in the master's program in ECSE at UIUC?

- Team participation and leadership
- Professional characteristics
- Administration & consultation
- A stronger self-confidence and skills to work with various agencies for program growth. A solid foundation with assessments and goal planning as well as staff development.
- Assessments
- Increased skills/confidence in working with parents/more holistic team approach
- Confident of my knowledge in EI system and how it affects the school system. However it is very frustrating because my district doesn't have the connection of EI system it needs to have.
- A better understanding of what I do- working as a team.
- Knowledge
- Clearer understanding of transitions from programs
- Team membership increased
- Understanding of IEP process

e.) Which particular competencies do you use most often in your current position?

- Team membership
- Understanding of IEP process
- Networking
- Working more cooperatively with families
- Interviewing
- Child development
- Parent interaction/team building
- Assessment of infant/toddlers, families
- Advocacy and support
- Team leadership and participation
- Administration and consultation
- Staff development
- Financial planning
- Delivering services to children and families

f.) What competencies were not addressed in the CASEI Program that you think should have been covered?

- Spending money once you have the money- how do you allocate expenses
- None- very comprehensive
- Dealing with the State of Illinois and its constantly changing ideas and methods of reimbursement.
- More emphasis on areas where "out of the box" consultation and administration could be used or approached

g.) How well did the CASEI Program prepare you for an administrative/consultative role in early intervention?

- It prepared me very well even though I've not pursued any positions as of yet. My outside internship was a real eye opener.
- Fairly well- I gained confidence in my knowledge and judgement
- I feel I would have a good beginning knowledge if I chose to move into administration/consultation
- I think it did a good job of preparing me for an administrative/consultative role in EI. It has helped me greatly with teaming.

h.) Please see the enclosed CASEI Program philosophy statements. How well did coursework match these philosophy statements?

- The philosophy statements matched the coursework
- Very close
- Philosophy was embedded in the coursework in a meaningful way
- They were well matched.
- The family and the child was always stressed in the coursework. It was easy to see from course to course how they (courses) related to each other and the philosophy of each program.
- achieved

i.). How well did your internship experiences (both on-campus and at your work site) match the philosophy statements?

- I was blessed with an excellent internship site. The staff although going through change seemed to made for the U of I program. The playgroup was very positive and philosophy related as well, but not long enough to develop relationships.
- The internship that I completed was exactly suited to what I do and what I learned.
- Both internships provided the opportunity to expand skills in a hands on approach with guidance from the instructors with the underlying philosophy.
- On campus was good, off campus missed the mark somewhat.
- They matched great – especially the on campus internship.
- Excellently
- Achieved/ right on

j.) Other comments or concerns that you would like to share regarding your experiences in the CASEI Program.

- I have grown in many areas due to this experience and would like to thank all involved in this opportunity
- I really enjoyed the whole experience
- I probably would <u>not</u> have been able to complete a M.Ed without CASEI.
- The CASEI program provided a wonderful educational experience for me and am grateful for the opportunity to share this experience with the family and children.

- I was most impressed with the quality of teaching – the adaptability of the teacher to change with feedback from the students. I also appreciated the clarity in the syllabus and expectations. Most of the time expectations were clear with a gradual building of skills to the meet the objective.
- I wish there was more time to really network and use time to pick brains and intelligence of the other students in the classes. Continue the team approach with faxes, news letters, alerts, job openings, etc from (or compiled by) the staff/students during and long after the program ends.
- I am very grateful for the CASEI program. If the classes would have not been offered on the weekends and over the summer, I could couldn't have finished my Master's program.

k.) Please complete the enclosed Competency Rating Scale. Mail the completed Competency Rating Scale form and this questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope by June 22, 2001.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire! Your responses will assist us in completing our final report and also in better serving students in the future. We applaud your commitment to young children and their families.

Survey of CASEI Program Participants
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
June, 2001
Continuing students (n=4)

1. How would you describe your current status? Please read over the entire list and check ALL which apply to your situation.

___ full time work (4)
___ part time work
___ early interventionist
___ teacher
___ administrator/supervisor
___ other (1 – trainer)
___ support staff member (O.T., nurse, speech therapist, etc.) (1)
___ unemployed

2. What is your present title or position?
   - Program Support Specialist
   - Even Start Parent Educator
   - School social worker
   - Infant-toddler specialist-trainer

3. How many years have you been in this position? (10, 1, 2.5, 3)
   (range= 1 to 10 yrs.) Mean= 4.13 yrs.

4. If graduated, how many years did it take you to receive your M.Ed. Degree? (3 yrs-will graduate at end of summer term)

5. If employed, check ALL of the settings and age groups with which you work.

___ school setting (2)
___ birth-three yrs. (3)
___ agency (2)
___ three-five yrs. (3)
___ hospital/medical setting
___ five yrs. and older (1)
___ other (please specify:

6. Please check ALL of the populations that you serve.

___ rural (3)
___town/small city (4)
___ urban (1)
___ suburban (1)
___ other (specify:

7. Please check ALL of the cultures/ethnicities of the families you work with:

___ African-American (4)
___ Hispanic (3)
___ European-American (3)
___ Asian-American (1)
___ American Indian (1)
___ Other (please list) (0)

8. If applicable, check the exceptionalities of the children you work with.

___ physical disability (1)
___ visual impairment (1)
___ developmental delay (2)
___ hearing impairment (1)
___ speech/language impairment (2)
___ autism/PDD/Aspbergers (1)
___ traumatic brain injury (1)
___ other health impaired (1)
___ other please list: (1trainer in all areas)

9. On the scale below, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the CASEI Program by circling the appropriate item with 5 being high satisfaction and 1 being low.

	High				Low	N/A
Overall quality of academic instruction	5	4	3	2	1	0
	(3)	(1) (ms= 4.75)				
Overall quality of academic guidance	5	4	3	2	1	0
	(3)	(1) (ms=4.75)				
Quality of on-campus internship	5	4	3	2	1	0
(Saturday Playgroup) n=3	(3)	(ms= 5.00)				
Quality of on-site internship	5	4	3	2	1	0
(internship at your work site) n=3	(1)	(2)	(ms= 4.33)			
Overall satisfaction with CASEI program	5	4	3	2	1	0
	(4)	(ms= 5.00)				

10. Now, please indicate your level of satisfaction with your current professional position.

Ms= 4.25	High				Low	N/A
	5	4	3	2	1	0
	(1)	(3)				

11. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions. If you need more space, you may add another sheet of paper.

a.) List THREE things which you consider most important to include in an Administrative/ Consultative Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) master's program.

- Grant writing and developing expertise in management issues
- Incorporating administration issues within each class
- Supportive professors who have worked in the field or are currently working in the field.
- Training on ethics.
- A good foundation on child development (typical and atypical)
- Foundation knowledge of disabilities (characteristics and methods)
- Admin. & methods
- The law (IDEA)
- Supervision experiences
- teaming

b.) What were the strengths of the CASEI Program for you (people, courses, networking, resources, experience, etc.)?

- Support of faculty-understanding work schedules
- Saturday classes
- Wide range of professional expertise in classes

- Excellent advising
- Excellent professors who were very accessible
- Meeting others in the same profession
- The faculty was well trained and expected high quality work
- Courses were informative and contained timely information
- If asked by others I would recommend the CASEI program at UIUC

c.)What were weaknesses of the CASEI Program (people, courses, networking, resources, experience, etc.)? Please list any suggestions for changes in the CASEI Program (i.e. things you feel should be included in a future grant and things that should not be included).

- Some professors were more helpful and supportive of the fact that as full time employees & family members we are pulled in lots of directions. All should remember.
- The availability of internet courses
- More information or participation is needed from low income or minority parents as guest speakers.
- Difficulty in organizing courses outside of special education –EPS or EdPsych. Include adequate funding to provide regular access to EPS & EdPsych

d.) What competencies do you feel you have acquired as a result of being a student in the master's program in ECSE at UIUC?

- Knowledge in developing cross cultural competence in working with families.
- Administration and consultation.
- I have gotten to know myself better-both strengths and weaknesses. Have learned a lot of intervention, working with families from all cultures and professionalism.
- Ability to organize and structure time and training as a result of taking courses while working full time.
- Supervision skills as a result of co- teaching.
- Knowledge of disabilities, methods, assessment and empathy/understanding of parents with disabilities.

e.) Which particular competencies do you use most often in your current position?

- Team participation and leadership
- All
- Knowledge of disabilities (characteristics) and assessment
- Organize and structure time and training/supervision

f.) What competencies were not addressed in the CASEI Program that you think should have been covered?

- I believe discussing the importance of developing Program Strategic Plans to guide program services based on vision, values & mission would be important.
- None
- More administrative methods

g.) How well did the CASEI Program prepare you for an administrative/consultative role in early intervention?

- Very well, but I view the program from the trainer perspective.
- I held an administrative role for 2 of my 3 years in the program. The CASEI program helped to support me in my role- it was very valuable to have experience while I had the education.
- Coursework paralleled responsibilities of admin/consultation
- Can administer a program

h.) Please see the enclosed CASEI Program philosophy statements. How well did coursework match these philosophy statements?

- I believe the program was directly developed from and operated from each of the statements.
- Extremely well
- I believe the program came very close to meeting the specified philosophy

i.). How well did your internship experiences (both on-campus and at your work site) match the philosophy statements?

- Excellently
- On campus – extremely well - Work site well

j.) Other comments or concerns that you would like to share regarding your experiences in the CASEI Program.

- Without this program I would not have been able to earn my master's degree- thank you.
- Much better at the job & serve children better because of CASEI.
- Thanks for the opportunity to network at the university. The faculty is outstanding.

k.) Please complete the enclosed Competency Rating Scale. Mail the completed Competency Rating Scale form and this questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope by June 22, 2001.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire! Your responses will assist us in completing our final report and also in better serving students in the future. We applaud your commitment to young children and their families.

CASEI Competency Rating Scale : Project Graduates (mean score)

1. Foundation Knowledge

Normal and atypical development:

1.1.1	4.25
1.1.2	4.50
1.1.3	4.62
1.1.4	4.62
1.1.5	4.50
1.1.6	4.37

Knowledge related to families:

1.2.1	4.50
1.2.2	4.25
1.2.3	4.50
1.2.4	4.62
1.2.5	4.87

Knowledge of teamwork

1.3.1	4.12
1.3.2	5.00
1.3.3	4.00
1.3.4	4.37

Foundations of early intervention

1.4.1	4.62
1.4.2	4.75
1.4.3	4.50
1.4.4	4.37
1.4.5	4.25
1.4.6	4.37
1.4.7	4.42
1.4.8	4.57
1.4.9	4.57

2. *Delivery services to children*

Assessment

2.1.1	4.12
2.1.2	4.37
2.1.3	4.50
2.1.4	4.50
2.1.5	4.12
2.1.6	4.25
2.1.7	4.25
2.1.8	4.37
2.1.9	4.37
2.1.10	4.62
2.1.11	4.00
2.1.12	4.25
2.1.13	4.62

Intervention

2.2.1	4.62
2.2.2.	4.75
2.2.3	4.37
2.2.4	4.62
2.2.5	4.87
2.2.6	4.75
2.2.7	4.87
2.2.8	4.87
2.2.9	4.62
2.2.10	4.75
2.2.11	4.87
2.2.12	4.75
2.2.13	4.50
2.2.14	5.00
2.2.15	5.00
2.2.16	4.75

Evaluation

2.3.1	4.12
2.3.2	4.87
2.3.3	4.62
2.3.4	5.00
2.3.5	4.75

3. Delivering services to families

Assessment

3.1.1	4.62
3.1.2	4.87
3.1.3	4.50
3.1.4	4.50
3.1.5	4.50

Intervention

3.2.1	4.00
3.2.2	4.12
3.2.3	4.62
3.2.4	4.62
3.2.5	4.62
3.2.6	4.50
3.2.7	4.50
3.2.8	4.37
3.2.9	4.50

Advocacy/support

3.3.1	4.62
3.3.2	4.37
3.3.3	4.62
3.3.4	4.50
3.3.5	4.87
3.3.6	4.50

Evaluation

3.4.1.	4.50
3.4.2	4.25

4. Team participation and leadership

4.1	4.62
4.2	4.12
4.3	4.62
4.4	4.50
4.5	4.75
4.6	4.37
4.7	4.12
4.8	4.62
4.9	4.37
4.10	4.75

5. Organizing service delivery systems

5.1	4.75
5.2	4.75
5.3	4.37
5.4	4.25
5.5	4.12
5.6	3.87
5.7	4.00

6. Professional characteristics

6.1	4.87
6.2	4.87
6.3	4.00
6.4	4.12
6.5	5.00
6.6	5.00
6.7	5.00
6.8	4.75
6.9	4.87
6.10	4.62
6.11	4.62
6.12	4.87

7. Administration and consultation

7.1	4.50
7.2	4.14
7.3	4.71
7.4	4.14
7.5	4.14
7.6	4.28
7.7	3.85
7.8	4.50
7.9	4.62

CASEI Competency Rating Scale : Continuing Students (mean score)

1. Foundation Knowledge

Normal and atypical development:

1.1.1	4.00
1.1.2	4.50
1.1.3	4.50
1.1.4	3.75
1.1.5	4.50
1.1.6	4.25

Knowledge related to families:

1.2.1	4.00
1.2.2	4.25
1.2.3	4.25
1.2.4	4.50
1.2.5	4.75

Knowledge of teamwork

1.3.1	4.50
1.3.2	4.25
1.3.3	4.50
1.3.4	4.25

Foundations of early intervention

1.4.1	4.50
1.4.2	4.25
1.4.3	3.75
1.4.4	4.50
1.4.5	4.50
1.4.6	4.50
1.4.7	4.00
1.4.8	4.25
1.4.9	4.75

2. Delivery services to children

Assessment

2.1.1	3.75
2.1.2	4.25
2.1.3	4.25
2.1.4	4.00
2.1.5	4.00
2.1.6	3.75
2.1.7	3.75
2.1.8	4.25
2.1.9	4.25
2.1.10	4.00
2.1.11	4.50
2.1.12	4.75
2.1.13	5.00

Intervention

2.2.1	4.00
2.2.2.	4.50
2.2.3	4.50
2.2.4	4.50
2.2.5	4.75
2.2.6	4.00
2.2.7	4.25
2.2.8	4.25
2.2.9	3.75
2.2.10	4.50
2.2.11	4.25
2.2.12	5.00
2.2.13	4.50
2.2.14	4.00
2.2.15	4.25
2.2.16	4.50

Evaluation

2.3.1	3.73
2.3.2	4.25
2.3.3	4.25
2.3.4	4.00
2.3.5	4.50

3. Delivering services to families

Assessment

3.1.1	4.75
3.1.2	5.00
3.1.3	4.75
3.1.4	4.50
3.1.5	4.50

Intervention

3.2.1	4.00
3.2.2	4.50
3.2.3	5.00
3.2.4	4.75
3.2.5	5.00
3.2.6	4.50
3.2.7	4.50
3.2.8	4.50
3.2.9	4.75

Advocacy/support

3.3.1	4.75
3.3.2	4.25
3.3.3	5.00
3.3.4	5.00
3.3.5	4.75
3.3.6	4.75

Evaluation

3.4.1.	4.50
3.4.2	4.50

4. Team participation and leadership

4.1	5.00
4.2	4.50
4.3	4.25
4.4	4.25
4.5	4.50
4.6	4.50
4.7	4.25
4.8	4.75
4.9	4.50
4.10	4.50

5. Organizing service delivery systems

5.1	4.50
5.2	4.50
5.3	4.50
5.4	4.00
5.5	3.75
5.6	4.00
5.7	4.00

6. Professional characteristics

6.1	5.00
6.2	4.75
6.3	4.50
6.4	5.00
6.5	5.00
6.6	4.75
6.7	5.00
6.8	4.50
6.9	5.00
6.10	4.50
6.11	4.50
6.12	4.75

7. Administration and consultation

7.1	4.75
7.2	4.00
7.3	4.25
7.4	4.25
7.5	4.50
7.6	4.00
7.7	3.75
7.8	4.50
7.9	4.50

CASEI Competency Rating Scale : Employers Survey (mean score)

1. Foundation Knowledge

Normal and atypical development:

1.1.1	4.50
1.1.2	4.33
1.1.3	4.33
1.1.4	4.50
1.1.5	4.25
1.1.6	4.08

Knowledge related to families:

1.2.1	4.42
1.2.2	4.42
1.2.3	4.25
1.2.4	4.58
1.2.5	4.50

Knowledge of teamwork

1.3.1	4.17
1.3.2	4.25
1.3.3	4.25
1.3.4	4.33

Foundations of early intervention

1.4.1	4.08
1.4.2	4.50
1.4.3	4.00
1.4.4	4.25
1.4.5	3,50
1.4.6	4.25
1.4.7	4.17
1.4.8	4.25
1.4.9	4.33

2. *Delivery services to children*

Assessment

2.1.1	4.42
2.1.2	4.25
2.1.3	4.50
2.1.4	4.58
2.1.5	4.25
2.1.6	4.33
2.1.7	4.33
2.1.8	4.25
2.1.9	4.33
2.1.10	4.25
2.1.11	4.33
2.1.12	4.42
2.1.13	4.42

Intervention

2.2.1	4.56
2.2.2.	4.56
2.2.3	4.27
2.2.4	4.45
2.2.5	4.45
2.2.6	4.36
2.2.7	4.56
2.2.8	4.45
2.2.9	4.09
2.2.10	4.56
2.2.11	3.82
2.2.12	4.36
2.2.13	4.36
2.2.14	4.56
2.2.15	4.45
2.2.16	4.27

Evaluation

2.3.1	4.17
2.3.2	4.33
2.3.3	4.25
2.3.4	4.25
2.3.5	4.25

3. Delivering services to families

Assessment

3.1.1	4.42
3.1.2	4.42
3.1.3	4.42
3.1.4	4.33
3.1.5	4.25

Intervention

3.2.1	4.50
3.2.2	4.33
3.2.3	4.75
3.2.4	4.75
3.2.5	4.75
3.2.6	4.58
3.2.7	4.25
3.2.8	3.83
3.2.9	4.25

Advocacy/support

3.3.1	4.58
3.3.2	3.92
3.3.3	4.42
3.3.4	4.33
3.3.5	4.33
3.3.6	4.17

Evaluation

3.4.1.	4.25
3.4.2	4.25

4. Team participation and leadership

4.1	4.33
4.2	4.55
4.3	4.33
4.4	4.25
4.5	4.33
4.6	4.50
4.7	4.36
4.8	4.50
4.9	4.33
4.10	4.55

5. *Organizing service delivery systems*

5.1	4.25
5.2	4.33
5.3	4.33
5.4	4.08
5.5	3.92
5.6	3.67
5.7	3.83

6. *Professional characteristics*

6.1	4.75
6.2	4.58
6.3	4.58
6.4	4.67
6.5	4.91
6.6	4.82
6.7	4.75
6.8	4.50
6.9	4.75
6.10	4.67
6.11	4.75
6.12	4.50

7. *Administration and consultation*

7.1	4.36
7.2	3.83
7.3	3.83
7.4	3.73
7.5	4.25
7.6	3.83
7.7	3.60
7.8	3.83
7.9	4.17

Appendix F

Summary of CASEI Students Internship Evaluations

Summary of CASEI Students' Supervisor Evaluations

CASEI Project
Intern Evaluation of Internship Process and Procedures

A. How comfortable did you feel with the following parts of the internship process?

Communicating with your university supervisor
4.7(4-5)

Understanding what was expected of you in this internship
4.3(3-5)

Understanding the competency-based nature of the internship
4.3(3-5)

Clarifying your goals for this semester
4.3(3-5)

Developing the individualized field experience plan
4.7(3-5)

Organizing your time&integrating your internship activities with your work responsibilities
4.1(2-5)

Completing the activities as delineated on your individualized field experience plan
3.9(2-5)

B. Are there any specific suggestions that you can make with regard to improving the internship process in any of the above areas?

- Perhaps the internship could be longer
- I would make no suggestions. The only reason I marked a 3 on the last item was because my work schedule and I was unable to complete some of the tasks on schedule.
- It was hard to integrate my time since I do not work in a 0-3 program.
- I experienced difficulty separating work and the internship. As I worked on the internship it quickly became part of my job.
- NA
- a timeframe? realistic picture of what project should involve (size).
- I felt the internship process was fine.

C. What have been the most useful aspects of this internship for you?

- One of the most useful aspects of this internship was having a great supervisor to guide me. Another useful aspect was the ability to have 2 semesters to complete the internship.
- Designing a curriculum that will be very useful in my current job.
- learning process of research and using technology

- The support from the supervisor. The opportunity to develop a useful tool for programs serving infants and toddlers.
- Have the time to develop an organized team of individuals-using planning skills gathered from other classes.
- Learning how to work, communicate with other professionals outside my job, and becoming more comfortable with people who are higher up or have more experience than I do. Learning how to communicate with a group of people (public speaking) although I still need to work on this.
- The planning and facilitating of the inclusive, parent participation workshop was a real "growth" experience in all aspects from the initial (and on going) planning, preparation to actual teaching the group. I also learned to work with a variety of volunteers and parents throughout the process. I enjoyed getting feedback from the volunteers and parents regarding positive changes for future playgroup.
- Learning about NAEYC accreditation. Utilizing internet searches to find resources. Working through the entire process to determine what the final product (Train the Trainers Manual) will look like. Completing the CASEI Project: Knowledge and Performance Competencies to determine strengths and weaknesses or needs in professional competencies.
- 1. The actual development of a plan. 2. Presenting the plan. 3. Receiving feedback from my supervisor as well as participant in the workshop.

D. What have been the least useful or problematic aspects of the internship?

- There was a problem with not having enough time, I would suggest 2 consecutive semesters.
- Finding time to get everything accomplished with my travel and work schedule. Keeping up with journal entries. Sifting through the mounds of internet resources that are available regarding the topic of training.
- The hardest part for me was the change in work milieu and the culture "shock" of different attitudes and expectations in a different setting.
- Time management. I also felt that trying to do a project for an agency I am not currently working for was difficult. I did not have the comfort level that I would have liked during this internship. I think it would have been easier and more interactive if my supervisor (job) was supportive and had a vested interest in what I was doing.
- I had trouble with documenting actual time. As I stated earlier, over the months, my internship became part of my job.
- Due to the nature of my job, time was definitely an issue. My supervisor was supportive of me working on this project during work hours.
- I feel the survey information could have been better obtained with current mail lists.
- Working with DHS- the coordinator of the lifeskills class rarely returned my calls and was never prepared for the workshops I observed.
- I have stated this before, but I wish I could have had my supervisor closer in distance when finishing up with my internship. Again, this couldn't be helped.

E. Please suggest and procedural changes that might improve the internship process for future CASEI students.

- NA
- More frequent phone contact (initiated by the student) with advisor.
- What about peer review or satisfaction surveys.
- Have meetings scheduled on a regular basis with the supervisor (providing location was not too much of a problem). Phone calls are okay, but I prefer more direct contact.
- The process was smooth for me. The development of goals for myself initially with my supervisors was very helpful to clarify expectations.
- I suggest being very specific about the hours required for this internship and if two projects are to be a part of the internship process, let students or help students plan very well for this to happen.
- I can't really think of any, it was a great, positive learning experience for me!

F. What changes (if any) have you made in your practice as a result of the internship training?

- I have changed the format of my parent-child playgroups to resemble the PIWI program. The results have been very promising. The program mission statement now incorporates our philosophy. The philosophy will serve as a "check and balance" to ensure we are providing the most appropriate services for children and their families. The internship program is now much more organized. I feel like I'm getting off to a great start with my new intern.
- Increased awareness and information of system weaknesses allowing for training/program development locally and on a state level. It has also made me re-evaluate where I am headed within the program.
- The final Train the Trainer's manual, with its new concept and format will be used in place of the old RAP manual. This new manual will incorporate some of the old with a lot of the new materials, specifically using Head Start Bureau training materials, thus increasing Head Start staff's capacity to train their own staff with materials that are readily accessible to them on site.
- I feel more comfortable with parent participation both in groups and in individual session. I would like to continue to expand my ability to use triadic strategies. One aspect I have currently tried is using the "Big Mac" single message switch for communication between child and mother. I put a message on the switch that I think the mother would want to hear her child say.

  For example: Hola Ma Ma?
  parts of a song I love you?
  eieio- What ja doing?
  (from Old MacDonald)

  My intent is to develop more eye contact and turn taking activity between child and mother. Then I set up the child to face the mother and be able to activate the switch while "talking" to his/her mother.
- Implemented more communication with parents and families, worked with a family during their transition more than I have done in the past.
- We now have a parent group that meets monthly. There has been a wide range of support from various providers of 0-3 years of age programs and over 3 programs. The members of my planning team have learned the benefit of writing goals, planning a session schedule and debriefing. These were often overlooked in the past. I assisted in writing two grants to help cover the cost of the group. I now have a budget for my

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

time, food, postage, paper, speakers, educational materials, a journal and a few other things.

- The scope of programming for infants and toddlers is so incredibly broad. I only scratched the surface of the information available. Many issues are still being researched- i.e. infant mental health, therefore little information is available.
- I have become more aware of family issues and how to assist.
- I have used information from my resource manual when talking to teen moms and other moms at my work site.

G. Additional comments (if any):

- Thanks!
- I did not fully understand about the "supervising observations"- I saw the project being "product" oriented as outlined in the informational materials. I think flexibility needs to be built into the program to fit the varying levels of the students and the nature of the internship/project- that's what separates this program from an "on-campus" Masters program.
- This was an educational and enjoyable experience.

CASEI Project
Evaluation of University Supervisor
(end of internship experience)

1. Completed tasks and responsibilities in a timely fashion.
   4.8(4-5)

2. Fostered in the intern an attitude of inquiry, independent thinking, and respect for alternative approaches.
   4.6(4-5)

3. Tailored supervision style to intern's level of independence in self-reflection while at the same time tried to increase intern's level of self-reflection.
   4.8(4-5)

4. Facilitated the intern's development of an independent field experience plan.
   4.7(4-5)

5. Focused feedback on intern's strengths and gave suggestions for intern's growth and learning.
   4.7(3.5-5)

6. Provided the intern with resources or sources of information (as needed).
   4.8(4-5)

7. Was available for discussion and assistance.
   4.8(4-5)

8. Used appropriate and objective procedures for evaluating performance and outcomes as specified in the individualized field experience plan.
   4.4(3.5-5)

9. Modeled interdisciplinary collaboration in professional interactions with the internship site.
   4.7(4-5)

1. Please comment about any supervisory skills that you think were problematic for this individual.

- In my experience over the last few months, and for my learning style, I have found no problems with the way my supervisor supervised my internship. She listened when I needed her, called when she needed to "check in" and answered my questions when they arose.
- No real problems. I thought my supervisor quickly developed rapport and a good working relationship. She followed the process outlined in the CASEI materials. Expectations were clear. Suggestions were helpful.
- None.
- None-my supervisor is and always has been an excellent source of support and resources.
- NA
- Distance away from my supervisor was a problem at the end of my internship. This was not a fault of my supervisor.

- I think overall the program needs to reassess the objectives and emphasis of the CASEI program with regards to off-campus, employee participants- there needs to be a creative approach (yet different!) to address the needs and balance the expertise and experiences of the individual student-It's also important to treat and respond to the non-traditional students as professionals with an extended knowledge base and opportunity for creative, innovative participation. Flexibility and adaptation will assure positive completion of the program.
- I think that it was a little difficult for my supervisor since I was in her first semester of interns. I feel that since, she has become more familiar and comfortable with the program.

2. Please describe the strengths you think this individual brought to the supervisory process.

- My supervisor was good at keeping things on the positive side. She was easy to talk to/with and our discussions were comfortable and collaborative. She was good at trying to guide me in the right direction.
- My supervisor is very supportive and able to draw from her own experience and knowledge. This insight allowed her to assist me to develop a plan that encouraged self-growth and a parent program that is well structured. She allowed me to work at my own speed and use her as a sound board for new ideas and problem solving.
- My supervisor always conveyed a willingness to assist/resource in any way she could and provided constructive, helpful feedback and materials. She promptly responded to inquiries and requests.
- My supervisor helped me stay focused on my goals and objectives. She is well organized and task oriented. She had the ability to redirect me and support me in my thinking when it was needed. She has a lot of knowledge and provided me with many resources.
- My supervisor demonstrated encouragement and patience. She emphasized with the E.J. working situation.
- My supervisor always gets back to me in a very timely manner. She always provides constructive criticism-she is never negative.
- My supervisor is supportive and allowed me to develop this project and tailor it to the needs of the programs I work with. She helped me to broaden my scope of thinking when I was so focused on the immediate task at hand.
- reliable. served as a great educational resource. available. organized. gave excellent feedback on observations made while on site visits. stimulated my growth as a professional.
- My supervisor provided context and background to my experiences. It was helpful to be able to share the reflection process of the internship with her. She provided me with feedback and positive suggestions. I appreciate my supervisor's willingness to talk thoroughly about a variety of topics.
- My supervisor has been extremely understanding of the problems that my work and travel schedule has created in completion of this project/internship. I'm a very independent worker and appreciated my supervisor's checking in and helping me stay on track even when I had other priorities. She is a wonderful listener and assisted me in doing self reflection when things got a little overwhelming.